THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1930

HOW MAY THE INNER UNITY AMONG THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES BE FURTHERED?[1]

ALFRED TH. JOERGENSEN
Copenhagen, Denmark

OLD MATHESIUS, the first biographer of Luther, joyfully and proudly reports concerning the University of Wittenberg that at this institution of learning "many good folk from every part of the Roman Empire and far heaven assembled to hear, assimilate and carry home with them the Wittenberg wisdom."[2] Himself a Saxon, Mathesius enumerates all the nationalities whose representatives he saw during his short stay at Wittenberg, and he divides them into two groups. First, his German neighbors, viz., men from Meissen, Saxony, the Rhine country, Franconia, Suabia, Bavaria, Austria, Silesia, Hesse, the Mark and Pomerania. Then comes the alien group, comprising representatives of Russia, Prussia (the author does not classify these with his German neighbors), Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Lithuania, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, the Wend and Wind settlements, Siebenbuergen, Wales, France, Spain, Scotland, England, and even of Greece.

That is to say, these men were the forebears of all the nations that are represented today in this Northland. Our fathers then went to Wittenberg. Let us think of them for a moment as they were crowded together on the uncomfortable benches of the Wittenberg

1 Read at the Lutheran World Convention in Copenhagen, June 26-July 4, 1929. Translated by Emanuel Poppen.

2 Johann Mathesius, *Dr. Martin Luthers Leben* (Reclam Edition), 151.

auditorium. The majority were poor; they felt like strangers among strangers; they were uneasy and worried because they knew that parents and teachers and clerics at home looked upon their studying at Wittenberg with distrust or even with loathing. But at the moment when the wonderful man came to his desk, poverty and loneliness, worry and nervousness were forgotten; all were spellbound when he spoke. And when they had to return home sooner or later, as Mathesius states, they really took Wittenberg wisdom home with them. Most assuredly we do not wish to forget that they did this. But to remind ourselves of that fact is not the only reason why we have met here.

The purpose of our coming together from all parts of the world and from many races is to hear Wittenberg wisdom and take it back home with us. I hope that I am voicing the desire of all who are present. Mathesius adds a severe comment after his enumeration of the strangers: "It may be that not all may have sojourned there for the sake of learning, because Judas was also in the school of the Lord Christ." We do not like to hear such a remark in these festival days. Yet we will not pass it by in silence. On the contrary, as we discuss the inner unity of the Lutheran churches, let us not forget that there is a bit of the nature of Judas in the heart of every one. It is rather strange that until now both the outer and the inner spiritual unity between the Lutheran churches have remained weak and insignificant. Even more strange is the fact that in spite of such fragmentariness Lutheranism has gone steadily forward and found its way to new lands and nations. If our Roman Catholic friends laud and emphasize the external, organized unity of the church, they cannot prove its necessity by the history of the Lutheran church. In fact, I should fear Rome more if Catholicism gave up its outward unity of organization and gathered all its resources to strengthen the inner, spiritual unity. And for this reason I would urge the Lutheran church to avoid every form of unity that is merely external. On the other hand, we must promote all movements that can strengthen our inner mutual relation.

The World Convention is the most comprehensive but not the

most thoroughgoing among these movements. There are local movements that penetrate more deeply. In the discussion of our subject we must not confine ourselves to the fact and the possibilities presented by the World Convention. It is too young as yet to become the center around which all unifying movements within the Lutheran church are to gather. In presenting experiences and suggestions at this time, we must consider local as well as world-wide ideas. Or, to state it in other words, if the Lutheran World Convention desires to be the gathering place of all conservative Lutherans, it must have room for the peculiarity of special Lutheran groups and for the peculiarity of their unifying movements. On the other hand, these groups must understand that they are but groups, and that one group cannot demand that the entire Lutheran church be co-ordinated with it.

GROUP MOVEMENTS PRESENT AND FUTURE

It may be best, at this point, to sketch briefly the most important group movements. In North America, on January 16, 1929, a large group met for the celebration of its tenth anniversary. It was the National Lutheran Council. It met in the city of Columbus—we Europeans regard this as a gesture of courtesy in our direction—and if we look at the list of speakers, we are impressed by the comprehensiveness of this group. There were, among others, the presidents of the Joint Synod of Ohio, the Augustana Synod, the Iowa Synod, the United Lutheran Church, the United Danish Church, the Lutheran Free Church and the Icelandic Church. The spiritual fellowship thus created means more for the Gospel in North America than we Europeans imagine. That this group has not forgotten the ecumenicity of Lutheranism because of its own problems, the representatives of suffering European churches who are here can testify.

Some months ago, another group could celebrate its jubilee, its sixtieth anniversary. It was the Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Konferenz, which brings together the conservative Lutherans of Germany and their friends. Led by distinguished men, this German movement has held aloft the banner of Luther-

anism and has remained conservative in spite of political and ecclesiastical crises that were more severe than in any other group.

Another group must be mentioned, that of the North. Here there is no organization. The churches themselves meet, or rather, factors within the churches, such as pastors, men and women of the diaconate, Sunday school leaders and others. For many years they have been coming together from all of the five churches. And I may say without impropriety that no group has had as many and as intimate experiences as the Northern. To a marked degree, we have experienced the difficulties and limits of co-operation. About seventy-five years ago, we had a romantic mighty Scandinavian movement, especially at Oslo, Copenhagen and Lund. Poets sang about the united North. There was talking and dreaming of political and ecclesiastical unity. The memory of those days full of ideals survives. Stern realities were ignored. Suddenly, very suddenly, when the world political constellation was changed, the romantic Scandinavianism disappeared and a cold wave followed that estranged the northern lands and the northern churches. Now we know the difficulties and the limits; and therefore the relation between the northern churches is closer than ever before. But because it is my heart's desire that no cold wave may follow the promising beginning made at the first World Convention, to separate the Lutheran churches and groups, I am asking you to consider with me the difficulties and limitations of our work.

But first a word about future groups within the Lutheran world-church. May we not hope, in days to come, to see a Romanesque group? Would it not gladden our brave fellow-believers in France to see a great French Lutheran church and beside it the Lutheran churches of Spain and Italy? Even four hundred years ago, there was a Lutheran spring season in both of these countries. And the Slavic countries! Even now, one can already speak of a special Lutheran church. Our friends who represent these countries here are hardly aware of it, but we who have visited the eastern states of Europe have seen the growth of the church in those parts. And on the horizon, in the far sunny lands of Asia, may there not be, at a later time when our days have passed, the

gathering of a Lutheran World Convention with special groups from the peoples of Asia beside those of America and Europe? Surely these are possibilities that we may view as goals. The inner unity of the existing Lutheran churches should promote the creation of a Romanesque, a Slavic and an Asiatic group. But let us return to the realities and difficulties.

EXTERNAL HINDRANCES TO UNITY

First, let us consider those pertaining to language. The bringing together of the existing groups has not been accidental. The American members all understand English; the members of the Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Konferenz all know German; and we of the North converse in our own languages. But when all of us meet, we encounter difficulty. In this respect it was easier for our forebears to meet, for the language most used by the theologians of all countries and in the lecture rooms at Wittenberg was the Latin. Nevertheless I do not wish to go back to those days. Luther has taught us what the use of the mother tongue means for the evangelical permeation of a people, and we do not wish to introduce a new theological, aristocratic language. Not only our sermons but our theology, likewise, must be presented in a language that all can understand. Of course, such a demand creates special difficulties for certain professors. And this thing is peculiar, as Luther has shown us, that every language, by itself, may be a special instrument for the use of the Gospel; one language may be the means of expressing something that cannot be presented in another language. To express it differently, the strange language, at first a hindrance and a difficulty, may become a gift and a treasure. But we must study other languages more than heretofore, and the new theological generation must show special interest for alien languages.

A greater hindrance than language is individual nationality with its far-reaching physical and psychical peculiarities, such as race, history, state politics, culture, etc. All of these things are not merely an outer armor that we can lay aside. It is, indeed, a part of our nature, the part that society has given us and from

which we, as social beings, cannot and must not separate ourselves. Even though we could do so, we dare not do it. Here again, our great Reformer has rightly interpreted Holy Writ in strongly emphasizing the importance of society—a theme, by the way, on which I should like to speak at some length, because our generation has become too individualistic and has followed Kierkegaard too much. But this is not the time or place for such a discussion.[3] Suffice it to say that we cannot give up our country, our race, history, culture, etc. On the contrary, we are in duty bound to defend all these possessions against internal and external foes. One cannot be an unattached Lutheran, that is, merely a religious individual; one is always a social being. And here the great difficulty results, inasmuch as every Lutheran Christian and every Lutheran church has a social individuality. War has accentuated the differences. But war alone is not responsible. The contrasts have been greatly intensified by the politics of peace. And the same thing has been done by many manifestations of culture.

How can we avoid these difficulties? Many say we must be neutral and work for our own purposes, but be careful and reserved among strangers. In God's dictionary you will not find the word neutrality. And God has allowed Lutheranism to spread among various races, peoples and forms of culture, not only that it may show the way of salvation to these races and peoples, but that they, with their various spiritual treasures, may serve each other. We in the North, for instance, admire the religious strength of the thought labor of the Germans, the inwardness of the Slavic emotional life, the clear mode of expression and the fine form of religiousness of the French, and the unfailing willingness to sacrifice of the Americans. Under God's direction, the work of learning to know and understand others, at first a hindrance, becomes a treasure. But it is work.

I must mention another difficulty. It belongs primarily in the class of problems of the several State churches, but can also be felt

3 In the festival brochure in honor of Ludwig Ihmels (1928), I have tried to say something about this subject in the treatise, "The Starting-point of Lutheran Social Ethics."

in the mutual relation of the churches. It is the social difficulty. Or, to state it more exactly: Various levels of population, both among upper and lower classes, are either not influenced by the spirit of Lutheranism or merely in a small degree. Luther tried to gain all classes, princes and nobility, learned men, citizens, peasants and laborers. I have nothing to say about princes and nobles, because their number is ever decreasing. But the men of learning! Is it not a fact that theology, the church's science, is more influenced by the other sciences than these by theology? And the working classes! Concerning this subject that is so sad for the Lutheran church to contemplate, one remark will suffice. The future of all denominations depends, primarily, on the extent to which they succeed in winning the laboring classes. For the greatest social question of our day, the question on whose solution the whole social order depends is, Whom will the laboring classes serve, God or Mammon? May we all, laymen and theologians, understand this situation.

INTERNAL DIFFICULTIES

The difficulties mentioned so far are outside of the church. I shall now speak of those found within it. First, there are the various church organizations. Our Lutheran churches have various forms of organization. Some are controlled more or less by the state; others have been disestablished. The ranking pastor may be called president or bishop or general superintendent or church-inspector. And think of the many names given to his assistant. Sometimes there is a layman serving beside the first pastor. Usually, there is a synod as the highest authority of the church, but frequently there is a different form of organization.

Furthermore, the relation of the church to other denominations must be considered. In many countries the Lutheran church represents a minority of the population, which must co-ordinate itself with other small evangelical groups and co-operate with them in order to maintain a bare existence. At this time the Lutheran church in Germany and the other evangelical churches exert every possible effort to obtain at least a share of the rights assured to the

Roman Catholic church, which has a much smaller membership, by the Concordat. Here in the North we have a different situation from that in other countries, because the populace knows but one denomination, the Evangelical Lutheran church.

Finally, there are the spiritual differences between our Lutheran churches. The difference of historical background and condition, past and present, has affected the nature and method of doctrinal presentation. We find a great difference in preaching and liturgy. But the differences are most noticeable in the life and work of the church, as for instance, in the organization and the division of work between pastor and laity. Such differences can be found within the same church group.

What was said about the various languages and nationalities applies to these internal difficulties. These differences can become a source of riches if one clears a path through them to find the evangelical residuum. This residuum, the heritage of the Reformation, is there beneath the differences. The various Lutheran churches must understand that this heritage of the Reformation can and must be utilized in various ways. In any one church group we dare not adhere strictly and stiffly to our traditional viewpoint, for conditions and environments may change, and then we must change our organization, manner of preaching and teaching, and methods of work. But the kernel must remain. If it is sound, then the main thing is as it should be. Then, in order that the inner unity of the churches may be furthered, we may feel free to make certain changes by patterning after the example of other Lutheran churches, in these days especially in regard to organization, liturgy, and also, to some extent, in regard to methods of practical work. We of the North, especially in Denmark, can learn much of Germany and America as to organization and liturgy. It may be that in other churches some benefit may be derived from a study of our methods of work; for instance, of our distinction between evangelization and social service, of our co-operation between clergy and laity, and of our principle that the local church itself, and not a number of societies, is to carry on the work.

MEANS OF PROMOTING UNITY

In view of all these differences and difficulties, but also in view of the encouraging experiences, among which this World Convention may be counted, let us see if we can find practical means of furthering the inner unity of our churches. In the first place, permit me to emphasize the necessity of the further development of group work. The difficulties confronting it are relatively small. If any one State church or synod in a group has conference meetings of a larger scope, representatives of the other churches or synods should be invited. The pastors' associations of the group and the professors likewise should meet. Special conferences for foreign missions, the diaconate, social questions, etc., are very important since they afford an opportunity for the exchanging of experiences. Here in the North, the pastors of one city, e. g., Malmoe, have invited the pastors of another city and a different country, e. g., Copenhagen. Or two pastors in different countries have visited each other. The same thing has been done by students. I am confident that additional ways of mutual approach can be provided for the churches of the same group.

But now comes the bringing together of the groups and, moreover, the assembling of the many scattered churches that have no groups. Also connection must be established with the young churches in Asia and Africa that are gradually becoming self-supporting. Here we face the real and great difficulties, linguistic and national. May I say a word of warning about the amateurishness that caused some difficulty here in the North about seventy-five years ago? In the work of foreign missions or of the diaconate we cannot be satisfied with mere enthusiasm. Neither will it suffice for this fraternal movement of the churches. Not every romantically inclined church tourist and not every sensation-seeking ecclesiastical journalist can give us advice or show us the way in this project. I cannot emphasize sufficiently that here, in the mutual relation among the various groups, and between the group-centered and those without group connections, as also in the relation to the far-off youthful churches, thorough and comprehensive knowledge must be the presupposition and the basis of all reciprocal

influence. Think of the difficulties we have had in relief work after the last war because of such warm-hearted but near-sighted amateurs who did not understand the situation and did not care to take the time to study it. Unless we undertake this fraternal movement of the churches on the basis of the thorough knowledge that the situation calls for, we might as well adjourn today.

It is not possible, however, to learn to understand conditions in short order. It takes time. A number of things can be done to help us attain this understanding. All church executives, especially in the distant churches and in those that lack group connections, should hereafter appoint men who are ready writers and speakers, who can give accurate information interestingly by voice or pen. Whenever other churches desire articles or addresses about a certain church or group, the desired information will be available to them if such an arrangement is made. There should also be some supervision of the church press. And we would kindly request all churches to afford the opportunity for such a reliable exchange of news with sister churches by means of their own publications or at the meetings of their conferences. After the first two world conventions it becomes a duty, one that we like to do, to tell our countrymen and national fellow Lutherans about the Lutheranism of our day. And it will be a real pleasure to invite guests from the other churches to our conferences. Many would favor the joint publication of a Lutheran periodical. In my judgment, however, the linguistic difficulties are too great at this time to make a general circulation of the periodical possible. But I hope that the Bulletin of the World Convention, hitherto edited by Dr. Morehead, will be generally used.

AN INTERNATIONAL LUTHERAN FACULTY

But such an exchange of news does not suffice. All such things are merely fragments, and we cannot be satisfied with them. We need a systematic, scientific study of modern Lutheranism. And at this juncture, I wish to present, from a different angle, the organization of an international Lutheran faculty, which I suggested at Eisenach. Since then I have received several sugges-

tions in regard to this project and I myself have given it further thought. I shall limit my presentation to two main points.

This is the first thought: If the relation of inner unity, on the basis of an appreciative and fraternal exchange of news, is to be established between our churches, future theological leaders must be instructed, and the best instruction is that which is given by selected experts, preferably those that are chosen from various churches. Only a few permanently employed instructors are needed for the international faculty, but in every semester there should be lectures by visiting professors from various churches. Correct and scientifically presented information concerning all that is going on in the many Lutheran churches of our day should be readily available at this source.

Before taking up the second main thought, I must emphasize something that has not been stressed as yet. Thus far I have spoken only of the differences found among present-day Lutherans. But the Lutheran church in 1929 is not a motley collection of stones that we are trying to assemble in a mosaic. The modern Lutheran church, in so far as its members are true to the Confessions, is a unit. It is a church. This spiritual unity, which self-evidently must be furthered, can be furthered to an extraordinary degree by the international faculty. This is the second main thought. The international faculty can have lecturers who make Luther and the Reformation and the confessional peculiarity of Lutherans a special study. The visiting professors may also discuss these themes, and the presentation of these subjects by men from various churches will shed new light upon the unity of our church.

This new faculty, with its very special duties, will be no competitor of the other faculties. The student seeking a special teacher or study will seek these, as heretofore. But it has already been demonstrated, and will manifest itself more and more, that many students and young pastors wish to spend a semester with a conservative faculty of another country, where they can learn something about modern Lutheranism and modern methods of Luther-research.

BROTHERLY LOVE

I have spoken at some length about the exchange of news and university lectures because these things constitute the necessary presupposition. Likewise, they are merely means. Something wholly different is the aim, the personal element, brotherly love. We must have this brotherly love in order to be able to say that we have inner unity. With a view to its attainment, I should like to point to another means in addition to the exchange of news, a means that may also be viewed as an aim. I refer to brotherly aid. If we help the brethren in bodily and spiritual need, even though we do not know them, the establishment of personal relations will follow spontaneously. The Americans have never approached us as closely as within the last ten years, following their brotherly gifts. Our brotherly aid —I do not like to call it Diaspora aid—must reach out farther and penetrate more deeply. It must be more systematic. We must not be content merely to give money. We must study conditions among the oppressed brethren, in order to be able to give them what is needed in addition to physical aid. Permit me to cite several examples.

In Spain Protestantism is weak and suffering, and Lutheranism does not stand out prominently. But I am sure that Lutheranism would mean a great deal for the spiritual life of the glorious Spanish people, if given an opportunity. We must therefore help the representatives of Lutheranism, not merely by gifts of money, but also by personal contacts and literary contributions. Some of us should visit Spain, learn the Spanish language, preach there and establish personal contacts. We must render assistance to the Lutheran literature of Spain to the extent permitted by the censor. In such countries as Poland, Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia where there are several Lutheran minority churches in various languages and where a Lutheran movement has been begun in a language hitherto unknown to us, the Ukrainian, we must give aid to the congregations so that they can hear and read the Gospel in their native tongue. In all suffering churches we must provide for the theological education of young men, for their Lutheran training and for their bodily needs. Such brotherly aid leads us to the

goal, to personal relations and brotherly love. You will readily see that a joint Lutheran faculty can render valuable assistance in such an undertaking.

And now I have something to say about missions. The missionaries will be able to help us in the old parts of Christendom because they are familiar with the inner relation among the Lutheran churches of the mission countries. On the other hand, we shall be able to aid the co-operation of Lutherans in the mission fields. In China and India one can see what such co-operation means. And here is a fact that I should like to stress in this connection: According to all experience, there is no nation that is not susceptible to Lutheranism. Therefore we need not hesitate to send out Lutherans as missionaries. But one thing needs to be borne in mind. We cannot make Danes or Germans or Americans of the peoples in mission countries. Their individuality must be preserved and this will give its peculiar stamp to Lutheranism among them. On the other hand, our friends in these young churches should understand that there is a Wittenberg wisdom that can become the knowledge of salvation for them.

SOCIAL SERVICE

Finally, there is the work of inner missions and social service of our church. If the Lutheran State Church is to progress at home, there is need of better and more truly Lutheran work in this sphere. We all desire an awakening among our people. We all desire the extension of Gospel influence to new levels of our people, to the indifferent and the adversaries. How can this be done effectively, how can it be done at all, except by means of sermons such as Luther preached, in harmony with the Scriptures and breathing the confidence of faith? But too frequently this fact seems to have been forgotten, that Luther has given us the germ of a social program, that he has shown us what society means. Many Lutheran churches do but little and apparently do not know what to do in these spheres. Passivity must be overcome. In the endeavor to carry out the ideas of the Reformation, we must stand united in a firm alliance.

We desire unity. We may say this because we believe that God is bringing us together. The delegates to the Second World Convention are the natural leaders within each church. The future Executive Committee must be the General Staff. We all must stand behind the leaders, ready to give spiritual and physical aid. And now, may I ask the question: Would you favor the establishment of a Luther Fund for the support of these purposes that mean so much for our church, an international treasury, where dollars and francs, crowns and Reichsmark are brought together; where one contributor hands over interest-bearing securities and another gives a part of his next month's salary; a treasury that is a purely external symbol of the church?

"Many good folk out of the whole Roman Empire and from far heaven" have met again as in the days of old Mathesius, and once more, as in those days, to hear Wittenberg wisdom. May we too, in 1929, carry this wisdom home with us. May we be unified with it and by it, so that at home, after we have been separated from the friends whom we met here, and when perhaps we may feel lonely, we may nevertheless feel united with them in the spirit. And may another thing come to pass that did not materialize in the days of Mathesius. Hereafter, may every Lutheran church attain and maintain spiritual, living fellowship with other Lutheran churches. When the Second Lutheran World Convention adjourns, let us all agree in this decision: Hereafter there must not be any isolated Lutheran church!

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND THE WORLD MISSION OF CHRISTIANITY

JOHN ABERLY
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THE subject of this paper states succinctly the general subject considered by a conference of theological professors and others at Drew University during the Thanksgiving recess, November 29 to December 1, 1929. It was called by the officers of the American Theological Society with the co-operation of the International Missionary Council. Because of the strategic importance of theological seminaries in the carrying out of the Christian world program outlined by the Jerusalem Conference during its memorable meeting, March 24 to April 8, 1928, such a conference as that held at Drew was thought exceedingly desirable to consider both the lessons that the Jerusalem Conference suggests for the improvement of theological education itself and the larger service that theological education may render in the carrying out of a Christian world program. With this as its chief purpose, it was to be regretted that the conference could not meet earlier; but it was wisely postponed until Dr. John R. Mott would return from his recent world tour. It is to be noted that it was a conference, pure and simple. There were papers followed by opportunity for questions and discussions. Any one was free to express his views however much they may have departed from accepted standards. There were no formal findings. These were purposely omitted. Because of this, however, it may be difficult to give a summary of its discussions. And yet the great importance of the matters discussed both to theological education and to world missions seems to suggest that such a report be attempted. The personnel of the conference and its representative character further suggest that such a report ought to be made. There were 110 registered dele-

gates, besides a number of visitors, representing no less than 58 institutions in the United States and Canada.

The Jerusalem Conference was impressed with the fact that the chief hindrances to the Christian world movement are to be found in certain thought currents in so-called Christian lands. Humanism, the relation of science to faith, secularism, relativism —these are the terms around which these thought currents tend to crystallize. These were discussed during the first day of the conference.

HUMANISM

What is Humanism? was presented in a paper by one of its leading representatives, Edward Scribner Ames, of the University of Chicago. He stated frankly that humanism would rule out what is known as supernaturalism, and with it revelation, and address itself to the relief of the needs of humanity through scientific means and social organization. What it calls other-worldliness is deplored on the ground that it diverts attention from the pressing problems of human need and "misdirects the stream of idealistic reflection and endeavor"—to the writer a signal illustration of the fallacy of the *either-or* method that is found in so many discussions.

And yet a good many humanists, Dr. Ames' paper goes on to state, take a friendly attitude towards religion and that because "religion has sprung from the deep urgent needs of human life and has sought to achieve friendly and satisfying relations with reality." This reality is however to be conceived of in terms of social science. When the claim is made that this may give us a profounder view of God than that we have given us in accepted Christianity, one could have wished he and those who agree with him would have been more definite. Nothing definite has yet been reached, we were told. In the meantime, men must live, and it would seem, for all that humanism has to offer, live without hope. It is this that moved Prof. A. T. Robertson to say that his objection to humanism was its inhumanism. It is reassuring, however, that when Dr. Ames was asked what humanism would do

with Jesus, his answer was that humanists have much more regard for Jesus than for Christianity, and, further, that Jesus is one of the most significant facts in our conception of God. The impression the discussion left is that humanism, because of its scholarly works, is a force with which theological education must reckon. And yet a religious humanism, if this be not a contradiction in terms, may be much nearer admitting the supernatural, albeit on a pantheistic background, than its advocates seem inclined to admit.

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

Because the Gospel is so often regarded in our time as being opposed by science, the "Scientific Method and the Christian Gospel" was given a place on the program and this was discussed in a paper by Dr. H. W. Wieman of the University of Chicago. He warned against four fallacies into which the Christian apologist is in danger of falling:

1. The Christian apologist should not take the teachings of any science for his faith. All sciences deal with theories which are intellectual tools for understanding things but which have no finality about them.

2. On the other hand, he needs also to be on his guard against the assumption that there is some way to reach the truth other than by the scientific method. It is the method that is permanent, not the conclusions.

3. He needs further to keep from making truth directly deducible from experience. Experience is the moral and spiritual reaction to a conviction. To make the experience prove the conviction is to move in a circle.

4. The apologist needs to be further warned against the habit, in some places so marked, of claiming that the name of some famous scientist, who is a believer, is sufficient to establish Christian truth. However valuable it may be to show that Christian truth is not ruled out by science or the scientific method, this of itself can not establish its truth.

On the positive side, Dr. Wieman's position may be summarized in his two statements that men are to commit themselves to all

that is best in reality and that all our beliefs are to be held subject to constant correction. Under that which is best in reality Christian truth has to maintain its place and faith affirms that it can do this through its insistence on love as the law of life.

In the discussion that followed, the standpoint of the paper about the tentativeness of our beliefs which are always to be subject to revision was criticized. It was pointed out that the tentativeness of the scientific method is incompatible with the demands of religious loyalty and devotion.

The rather tenuous conclusions of the paper must be viewed from its strictly scientific standpoint. It cannot however be disassociated from what must be regarded as inadequate conceptions of both the Gospel and of faith. The Christian Gospel is defined as that which is proclaimed concerning the meaning and value of the life of Jesus. Asked in the discussion for a definition of faith, the statement was made that faith is belief and an acting on belief, and that to act without absolute certainty is faith. It need hardly be pointed out how far short these come for those for whom the Gospel is the grace of God in Christ Jesus and faith the filial assurance of acceptance through the Beloved. But it is reassuring that if science can not lead us into this inheritance, it can, by stressing the obligation to commit ourselves to the best in reality, lead us to the threshold of such a faith and bid us enter though it may not be able to accompany us.

SECULARISM

Of all the forces antagonistic to Christianity and its world program, the most serious because the most widespread is that which goes under the name of secularism. Bishop F. J. McConnell led the discussion on this subject. The strength of secularism, he maintained, rests on:

1. The demand of the present for practical and measurable results. This is the demand made even of religion itself. The fact is overlooked that men need religion independently of secular values.

2. The paradoxical situation that insists on regimentation

for society at the same time that it advocates anarchy for the individual adds to its strength. Men blame the social order and justify their own delinquencies by its shortcomings. In individual affairs there has been a strong current back towards paganism.

The part of wisdom however for our time is to recognize that the secularist point of view can not be stopped but that it is bound to expand. The philosophy of Pragmatism by William James, and that of Instrumentalism by John Dewey are evidences that it has the prestige of intellectual respectability. It must also be recognized that it is going to be a great instrument for material expansion and even for social betterment. In this a noble secularism may be Christianity's greatest rival. But its tendency is to lead men away from the distinctively Christian values. A middle ground must be sought between following it and running away from it and that will be found in the method of control.

RELATIVITY IN ETHICS

The Jerusalem message also pointed out the dangers to the Christian program because "on all sides doubt is expressed whether there is any absolute truth or goodness." "A new relativism struggles to enthrone itself in human thought." Reinhold Niebuhr discussed the question growing out of this statement under the heading "Moral Relativism and the Christian Ethic." There is that in ethics which is affected by time and place. This has always been recognized. At present however there are trends which stress this to the exclusion of any absolute truth or goodness. Behaviorism, which is the vogue in psychology, as also the tendency to make our ethics but the expression of social values which may change with the social order, may be regarded as the chief of such trends. Over against this Christianity claims, in the ethical idea of Jesus, to have that which is eternally valid, however apparent the differences may be in the apprehension and the application of his law of love. Instead of having either the absolute or the relative in ethics to the exclusion of the other, we ought to see the absolute in the relative. "This comes to appearance at two points in the Christian ethic—in the absolute obligation of an in-

dividual to follow its highest insights, and in the element of revelation of ultimate reality." In the end it is true of course that the conviction of the holy, moral, loving will of God on which an absolute ethic must be based, involves a large measure of faith. "Verification remains incomplete. For Jesus upon the cross the only verification was a final daring act of trust; Paul staked everything on the verification offered by the resurrection of Christ. We are not free from the same trust in the actuality of God's love. But the trust is not blind trust; it is supported by the moral experience of the race. And in it at least and alone our religious relativism must yield to the affirmation of the absolute."

In the discussion, attention is called here only to the statement by Dr. Leonard Hodgson, of the General Theological Seminary, New York. This was to the effect that we do not know the absolute. What we need in ethics is objectivity with flexibility. God provided this by putting it in a human life. In all things man needs to cultivate the mind that can see things through. In ethics we need to cultivate the mind of Christ that can then solve the problems of conduct as they may arise.

DR. MOTT'S ADDRESS ON THE WORLD MISSION OF CHRISTIANITY

All that had been discussed up to this point was preparatory to this, which was the main subject of the conference. As will be seen from what is given above, the subjects hitherto discussed grew out of the preamble to the Jerusalem message and directed attention to the dangers that threaten the world mission of Christianity and that more from the disintegrating forces at work in so-called Christian countries than from any antagonism that comes from non-Christian lands. The present world-situation as it affects missions was discussed in a masterly address by Dr. Mott, who has just returned from his fourth tour around the world and his eighth to the Orient as a student and a promoter of missions. Because of his many-sided international activities as President of the International Missionary Council, of the Student Christian Federation with its 300,000 members, of the International Young Men's Christian Association, and of the Social and Religious Survey

Commission, he has the world-wide contacts which enable him to speak with peculiar authority on this subject. The order of his presentation is followed in this summary of his address.

PRESENT TRENDS UNFAVORABLE TO MISSIONS

1. Among the trends unfavorable to missions must be placed first the almost impossible burdens that the people in mission lands are carrying. Japan had one-sixth of her property blotted out in the earthquake of a few years ago. The average income of a peasant there, according to Kagawa, is 49 yen a year of which only 33 yen come to the peasant himself, an average of about $1.50 a month. In Korea fifty per cent of the people are hopelessly in debt. China has had two decades of costly civil wars. Upwards of 12,000,000 died there in the recent famine. In India 100,000,000 go to sleep hungry every night. The hopelessness, and even despair, resulting from such situations are exceedingly depressing.

2. The spirit of nationalism is everywhere more pronounced and has more sense of direction. It presents on the one hand, the most promising and, on the other, the most difficult situation that missions are called on to meet. This spirit of nationalism requires that the church rather than the mission be the organization that is made responsible for the carrying on of mission work. With reference to the new churches, the matter of chief concern however is not their autonomy but their vitality to do the work committed to them.

3. The startling lowering of the prestige of Western nations in the eyes of Eastern countries is a serious factor in the situation. The "unequal treaties" are largely responsible for this and they need to be revised. The world is oscillating between fear and cupidity. Not less than 3,000,000 men are now under arms in Asia alone. There are 30,000,000 under arms in the world and this is 10,000,000 more than before the World War.

PRESENT TRENDS FAVORABLE TO MISSIONS

In spite of these unfavorable tendencies, Dr. Mott presented such an array of hopeful features in the world situation today that

he inspired all with his optimistic outlook. These can be but briefly mentioned.

1. He found twenty voices in Asia speaking for good will now to one that he found on his last visit only four years ago.

2. The light has been turned on the situation and the unequal treaties are being condemned. This is the first step towards their removal. For this educational process large credit must be given to the Institute of Pacific Relations.

3. A new generation educated in the West is rapidly rising. Of the ten members now in President Kai Shek's cabinet, Dr. Mott stated that he had intimately known six while they were students in America.

4. The League of Nations, the World Court, the Kellogg Pact and other international agreements are most promising factors in the present world situation.

5. The missionary establishment numbering 30,000, scattered throughout every land, furnishes one of the most powerful forces for the promotion of good will among the nations. In spite of the present policy to reduce their number, Dr. Mott is most insistent that their number should be increased, and that the promotion of friendly relations should be made a more integral part of their work. When asked, after the address, how he accounted for the falling off of interest in missions by the Christians of the West, he gave it as his opinion that while gifts to missions were not decreasing, they had not kept pace with giving to other causes. While in America last year a total of $2,400,000,000 had been given to philanthropic and social work, the amounts given to missions had not perceptibly increased. He thought it was due to lack of up-to-date information, to a failure to visualize the greatness, the wholeness and the oneness of the work, and to the fact that we do not have the men that we ought to have. To this he added a failing in what is motivating men and added these significant words: "I would not send out any missionary who does not have a first-hand experience of Christ—that is, who has not faced Christ and found in him something that he found nowhere else."

6. The fact that though the division of the Christian forces

imposes a tremendous handicap on our work—as an illustration there are nineteen theological seminaries in Japan with only 600 students, all told—the influence of Christianity was never so penetrating and so widespread as it is now. The genius of mission work is to rivet the gaze of men on the Christ of the Ages and of Eternity. As a signal illustration of this, the work by Kagawa in Japan and his writings, of which *Love the Law of Life* has just been published in English, may be cited.

7. There are undoubted signs of a growing interest in religion—"a rising tide of faith." To be convinced of this one need only take counsel of those who have wide contacts. The bookshops also testify to a revival of interest in religion, which is still the chief concern of men.

8. In line with this must be noted a marked quickening of the social conscience. "Jesus Christ is the last court of appeal in morals in Asia," as is evidenced by the public utterances of leading non-Christians there.

This should not blind us to the fact however that the anti-religious forces in Asia have by no means spent their force. The Soviet program is a power to be reckoned with in India, the Dutch East Indies, China and the other countries of Asia. Even Japan, loyal and settled though she may be, has her "dangerous thought" movement. In spite of this, the appeal by the leaders of opinion to the authority of Jesus Christ continues and this is of profound significance.

9. The fact that secular and religious forces are working together in a higher synthesis is of profound significance to world missions. When it comes to what is known as secularism, about one-sixth of it is anti-religious and must be rejected while the other five-sixths can be made an ally to the Christian missionary movement. In the thirty conventions held in this last tour around the world, outside experts took part and made most important contributions freely to the work of missions.

10. There is a new psychology developing among the workers of the East. It would help us if it would develop here in the West. Instead of spending all its energies in dealing with

doubts and difficulties, it deals with the certainties of our faith. The messages of Dr. Stanley Jones may be cited as an illustration of this.

PRESENT TRENDS IN THEIR RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

What bearing do the above facts have on the future preparation for the ministry? This was the third question that Dr. Mott discussed, and concerning it he made the following suggestions:

1. Seminaries should aim to make and keep vivid a sense of awareness and of realization of the above situation in the future leaders of the church while they are pursuing their theological studies.

2. A revision—or rethinking—of the curriculum is needed, making it more comprehensive and symmetrical, perhaps more extensive and longer, certainly more intensive. Apologetics, religious education and church history do need more attention than they are now receiving in most cases.

3. Some persons ought to prepare a new series of books on the preparation of missionaries on the lines of those issued shortly after the Edinburgh Conference. They served their purpose splendidly at the time, but are now hopelessly out of date.

4. More of the dynamic and the creative forces from the mission fields themselves ought to be brought into our seminaries. Christian leaders from among the nationals of the various countries ought to be secured to give courses of lectures to the students in the institutions.

5. Sixty or seventy of the brightest young men among seminary students should be kept in preparation for a longer time and encouraged to become specialists.

6. The students in the seminaries should be stimulated to acquire certain habits which are essential to their future success. Among these may be mentioned:

The habit of cultivating their own spiritual life.

Habits of meditation and of the study of the original writings of our own faith as well as those of other faiths.

A recognition of the fact that the principal part of prayer

often is what we do before and after prayer so that we may have real fellowship and communion in the purposes and in the works of God.

Cultivation of the right attitude towards temptation and with it the cultivation of penitence—the humble and the contrite heart. This would produce much-needed humility.

The practice of the presence of God would in a word cover all of these necessary habits.

THE CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC

One entire session was devoted to the consideration of the Christian apologetic for today. Four papers were read by four different readers—President C. M. Jacobs of the Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia; Professor Frank Gavin of the General Theological Seminary; Professor H. P. Van Dusen, of the Union Seminary; and Professor H. F. Rall of Garrett Biblical Institute. They were to present the subject from different denominational and sectional angles, but it was remarkable to see their general agreement. With varying emphases, all pointed out the fact that we need an apologetic that does not spend its energies on dead issues. Apologetics have always varied according to the attacks they had to meet. Just now its most insidious and strongest foe is a "noble secularity" that aims to keep its values without accepting its beliefs. Several stressed the fact that Christianity is its own best witness, that a good theology is its own best apologetic, but President Jacobs rightly pointed out that our great need is a clear and common conception of what essential Christianity is. Dr. Gavin arranged his discussion around Facts, Fruits, Feelings and Findings. The Facts are to be found in the unique Personality of Christ in history, the Fruits in the values that appeal to men today, the Feelings in the worship which meets men's religious needs, and the Findings in an experience, personal and social, checked by fellowship. Prof. Van Dusen called attention to the fact that our apologetic must meet present day criticisms and these are that Christianity is intellectually indefensible and morally ineffective. We have lost spiritual and moral effectiveness. Our ministry is

unconvincing because it is itself unconvinced. Our answer must be the demonstration of a new life.

In addition to the addresses directly on the subject of the Christian Apologetic, the addresses by Dr. Mott and by those who discussed the message of the Jerusalem Conference at the last session ought to be mentioned under this topic. These addresses support the position of the papers that an indirect apologetic is often the most effective one. A vital Christian faith will by its life and work be its own best witness.

THE THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM

The theological curriculum was not discussed in detail. Only one paper, that of Prof. Latourette of Yale, had direct bearing on the subject of world missions, and that presented a syllabus for a course on this subject to cover a semester's work of three hours a week. The course covers a wide field and would be justly chargeable with attempting to cover too much were it not that its aim is the practical one of enabling pastors to become intelligent guides of their congregations in presenting the missionary enterprise. The greater part of this session was given however to a consideration of the projected survey of theological education now in progress. Prof. Mark A. May, of Yale, is the director in charge of this survey and he himself presented in outline what it proposed to do. As such an intensive study is now being undertaken, any suggestions for a revision of curricula may well wait until its results are available.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE

The last session of the conference was given over entirely to a consideration of the Christian Message as adopted by the Jerusalem Conference. It may be in place here to remind the reader that that deliverance gives the substance of the Christian message to be none other than Christ himself; that the missionary motive again is Christ, God's love in Christ; that the spirit of the missionary endeavor must be the meekness and gentleness of Christ that expresses iteself in humility, in penitence and in love. Its call to

the Christian world is to stand firmly on the rock of Christian conviction and accept wholeheartedly its missionary obligations, going forward in full loyalty to Christ to discover and to express the treasures in his unsearchable riches. Its call to the non-Christian world is to join in the study of Jesus Christ as the One who is able to satisfy the world's needs and to point the way to a solution of its problems without asking any one to give up anything good that he finds in any other religion or in a secular civilization. It is a deliverance that deserves the attention of all Christians because with its world-wide sympathy it yet makes so clear its loyalty to the name that is above every name.

President E. C. Herrick, of Newton Theological Seminary, discussed the message from the standpoint of making it effective. This must be done by working along denominational lines in the spirit of co-operation. Dr. Herrick criticized rather sharply union movements, which, he said, generally had more union than they had movement. The denomination is still the organization which must adopt and put into effect the message of the Jerusalem Conference if it is to be made effective in a world program for missions.

Prof. H. E. Luccock, of Yale, discussed the main feature of the message itself. This is Jesus Christ himself. It is not a new message. Our age is under the tyranny of what is new. A person may be pathetically out of date; he may also be superbly out of date. A religion without God, as some now would have it, would be a very quiet religion. How long can you have the social effects of a religious faith after the sun of faith in God has gone down? Following the message of the Jerusalem Conference we shall be kept on the main lines of a really Christian program for the world.

President H. L. Reed, of Auburn Seminary, closed the conference with an appropriate sermon.

The three days spent in conference on this one great theme impressed one with the magnitude of the task and the large part the theological seminaries are called on to play if the task is to be accomplished. It makes large demands on theological education.

This is however only an echo of the demand that Jesus himself made on a much smaller school of apostles when he bade them go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, and yet along with the command told them to wait till they were endued with power from on high. The year 1930, the nineteen hundredth anniversary of Pentecost, may be a peculiarly appropriate time for the church to have brought before it this great world mission program of the Jerusalem Conference.

THE CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC FOR TODAY[1]

CHARLES M. JACOBS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

THE writer of this article is not a systematic theologian, but a teacher of Christian history. In the apologetic field he is only an observer, deeply interested, but imperfectly informed. The most that he can contribute to a discussion of apologetic is an outsider's view of it.

To such an observer it seems quite evident that the primary present need of apologetic science is for a definition of its task. Before we can have an effective apologetic, we must have a perfectly clear notion of the purpose that apologetic is to serve. There are, broadly speaking, two conflicting conceptions of it current among us.

There are those who believe that the sole purpose of apologetic is defense. The duty of the apologete, so the advocates of this view hold, is to buttress with rational argument the positions that have been traditionally considered Christian, and to destroy with the weapons of reason all the arguments that can be advanced against them. Such an apologetic deals with matters of detail. It sets theism against atheism, creation against evolution, miracle against natural law, revelation against reason, inspiration against historicism. It conceives each of these pairs as a separate antithesis to be discussed and resolved, in each case, in favor of the first term. It does not seek new answers to any of the questions; the answers are, in fact, its data, and while it may seem to be seeking new arguments in support of them, it actually does little more than repeat arguments that have been in use for centuries.

1 The major portion of this article was embodied in a paper read before the Conference of Theological Seminaries of the United States and Canada, at Drew University, Nov. 30, 1929.

This is the traditional view of apologetic. It has been current in English theology since the days of deism, and has its classical exponents in such really distinguished apologetes as Butler and Paley. No one contends that the apologetic systems produced in earlier times by this method are adequate to the needs of the present generation, but well-worn grooves are hard to break out of, and there are many who seem to feel that the method itself is sound and can be applied effectively to the problems that now press for solution, provided only that the apologete can acquire sufficient skill in the handling of his material and arm himself with sufficient knowledge.

An apologetic so conceived is subject, however, to very definite and serious limitations. For one thing it cannot be productive of permanent results. Other theological disciplines are more favorably situated in this respect. The purely biblical sciences, for example, may aspire to permanent achievements. They seek to discover truth by the application of well-approved methods to materials that are at hand. It is at least conceivable that they should some day attain finality, and that we may know for certain many things about the Scriptures that are still in the realm of hypothesis and conjecture. The same thing is true in even higher degree of Christian history. In that field we have already reached many definite and indisputable certainties. Even such theoretical sciences as ethics and dogmatics may hope to attain something that approaches permanent validity, however dim and distant the hope may be. But a science that aims at nothing else than the defense of conviction against attack must always be a changing science, adapting itself continually to changing forms of denial. It may be questioned whether a science thus limited in its purposes can be called a science at all, and not rather an art. Its value must be pragmatic merely; it is good, if it works.

This purely defensive type of apologetic has a second limitation in the fact that the truth of Christianity is quite incapable of rational demonstration. We need not go to Tertullian's extreme and say with that really great apologete of seventeen hundred years

ago, "It is credible because it is impossible; it is certain because it is foolish."[2] Nevertheless we ought to recognize the truth which that exaggerated statement does contain. Neither Jesus nor Paul ever claimed to be able to produce rational proof of his doctrine, and it may well be doubted whether, in all the nineteen centuries since Jesus, any man has ever been urged into Christian belief. The method of rational demonstration has a proper place in dogmatic theology, for there the premises of an argument are admitted, or assumed, and the dogmatician has both the right and the duty to draw conclusions from them; but the traditional apologetics attempts to defend the premises, and their truth cannot be established by purely rational procedures.

The most that this method can do is to show that the fundamental Christian truths are not unreasonable, and that a reasonable man can hold them and still retain his intellectual integrity. Such an apologetic, if successful, can resolve the doubts of believers, but it cannot destroy unbelief. I do not wish to question the practical utility of an apologetic that can do even that much. It has distinct value of a practical kind, especially for the pastor in his daily contacts with the more superficial varieties of unbelief as they show themselves among the people to whom he ministers. But to the theologian, it ought to be perfectly clear that this type of apologetic is altogether inadequate and limited in value.

For such an apologetic does not and cannot reach the really serious and important sources of doubt and unbelief. These are not intellectual, but moral and spiritual. Where there is one man whose aversion to religion is intellectual, there are ten thousand whose doubts are of moral and spiritual origin. The antagonisms to Christianity that arise from these sources do, of course, tend to take on intellectual forms. They create unchristian and antichristian philosophies of life. But the strength of these philosophies does not lie chiefly in their intellectual power. Their popularity is

2 *Credibile est quia impossible est; certum est quia ineptum est.* Tertullian's only mistake is in the *quia*. If he had used an adversative instead of a causative, he would have come very close to Paul's apologetic against the Jews and Greeks in I Corinthians i, 18 ff.

usually due to the fact that either in their premises or in their conclusions they express what men want to believe, and for this reason they cannot be effectively answered by argument alone.

Such a philosophy, for example, is that which comes to expression in Professor Beard's symposium, *Whither Mankind.* It is a frank and unveiled secularism, and the answer to such a world-view does not lie in the intellectual sphere at all, but in the moral. From the Christian viewpoint it is quite plain that it presents a low ideal of life, both individual and social, but "lower" and "higher" are judgments of worth which lie beyond the reach of logical proof. There is no rational demonstration that the ideals of Paul were higher than those of the modern man, whose chief desire, according to Mr. Hendryk Van Loon,[3] is to find "the shortest way to a porterhouse steak." Admittedly the two kinds of ideal are sharply contrasted, and the contrast does present an intellectual problem, but the problem centers in the question, "Why will men be choosing the lower ideal of life instead of the higher?" The question "Which is lower and which higher?" is given in advance. It is the answer of conscience.[4]

A similar case is presented by the humanistic philosophy which is deeply affecting certain schools of religious thought in our day. When one reads such a book as Mr. Walter Lippman's *Preface to Morals,* one feels oneself in the presence of a tragedy; for it is a tragic thing to see the sense of God disappearing behind any other conception, even so fine and lofty a concept as that of "humanity." But one also feels the futility of argument to avert this tragedy. The humanist has missed something that the Christian has, but

3 In Professor Beard's book above referred to.

4 Cf. the following from Professor D. M. Baillie: "I may or may not be able to say 'why' selfishness is wrong, or I may think I know why and (with many another hapless moral philosopher) be quite wrong in the theory I have embraced; but all this does not in any way affect my intuitive certitude that selfishness *is* wrong. That is never an issue in ethical science or anywhere else. If any man were to make an issue of it—were to say, for instance, that there is nothing the matter with selfishness, dishonesty, or unbridled sensuality—it might be difficult to know what to do with him, but we should at any rate not dream of *arguing* with him." *The Interpretation of Religion* (New York, 1928), pp. 344 f.

he Christian cannot prove to the humanist the reality of the thing hat he possesses.

These illustrations may help to make it clear that we are in erious, and sometimes distressing, need of an apologetic that tran-cends the limitations which the nature of the traditional apolo-etic imposes. We need the kind of apologetic that will go down o the roots of things, that will not be content with attempting to nswer criticisms, objections, and denials, but will present Chris-ianity positively and constructively to our own generation. Such n apologetic will be interested primarily in Christianity and only econdarily in the demonstration that other views of life are un-hristian or unsound or both. Christianity has always been and ill always be its own best apologetic, and the offensive will always e the best defense.

The student of Christian history cannot forget that it was in his kind of a positive apologetic that Christian theology had its irth. Justin Martyr and his spiritual and intellectual kin in the econd century wanted to prove to the Roman world that Christi-nity was not immoral and not absurd; and they did it by telling vhat Christianity, as they conceived it, was. From the days of he Greek Apologists to the present day, the great constructive heologians have been apologetes and the great apologies have been ositive statements of truth. These statements have been framed vith constant reference to the thought-currents amid which their nakers have lived. It is but seldom, outside the realm of pure nathematics, that any men are able to clarify their thought about nything otherwise than by seeing it in contrast with beliefs and pinions that they do not share. If it had not been for Gnosticism nd Neoplatonism the church would not have had an Origen; but or Pelagianism it would not have had the Augustin whom we now; but for the Enlightenment, we would have had no Schleier-nacher. We may not share these men's theologies, but no student f history can fail to recognize the potency of the influence which heir thought exerted upon and beyond the generations that pro-luced them. They were apologetes whose power lay in affirma-ion, not in denial, and the Titanic power of Martin Luther was not

in his negatives, numerous and emphatic as they were, but in his simple, positive ideas, not in the reformations, but in his faith.

In the present situation, our greatest need is for a clear and common conception of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The lack of it is the great weakness of the church, using that term in its broadest sense. It is far more serious than the lack of external unity because it not only permits, but creates, division within the external units that we now have. All earnest men deplore the lack of external unity. All of us desire to remedy a situation that we deplore. All of us want to add our fractions and make an integer, but we cannot add them until we find a common denominator. This common denominator must be discovered in the kind of apologetic that I have been trying to describe. In the existing situation all of our beliefs are challenged—not all of them from one quarter, but everyone of them from some quarter. We must face that challenge. In order to do so we must examine ourselves. We must ask ourselves what we do actually now believe to be vital and fundamental Christian truth and why we do so believe. In answering those questions we shall be doing two things at once—we shall be constructing a Christian apologetic and finding our way toward unity.

This positive apologetic must be more than a defense of tradition; it must be an interpretation of life. It must set all life, including even the life of unbelief, in the light of Christ. For this reason it must be hospitable to new truth. It must welcome truth, even when that truth is spoken by men who are in no sense Christians. It ought to be able to say to all earnest seekers after the highest and the best, "Him whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare we unto you."

The time has gone by when we have a right to make our apologetic merely a detailed argument in defense of traditional doctrines. We have to deal with questions that are not matters of detail at all, or even of "doctrine," in the common use of the term, but of total world-view. Is there a revelation of God elsewhere than in the realm of natural law? Is there, in fact, any other realm? Do the time-honored "proofs" for the existence of

God really prove that there is a God whom we can think of as the "Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?" Is there any reality that corresponds to the ideas which we call "religious?" Is Christianity a religion of redemption or is it merely a projection of the hope that "springs eternal in the human breast"? If it is a religion of redemption, what is the nature of that redemption—is it individual or social, present or future, redemption from sin or redemption from pain?

This is the kind of questions that the apologete has to meet in our generation, and he has to answer them in the light of all the new knowledge of the physical universe that the last two generations have acquired. He has to remember, also, that there are great masses of men who are not asking these questions, or any other questions that are serious, but are living as though the questions were already answered in an unchristian sense, or as though the answers did not matter.

The report of the English Conference on the Preparation for the Ministry, held at York, April 2nd to 5th, 1929, states, as one of the conclusions of the conference, "that in the world situation which the church is facing at the present time, the leadership that is supremely needed is that of theologian," and that "all the practical activities of the church throughout the world need the reinforcement of a fresh intellectual statement of the Christian Gospel in relation to modern conditions."[5] With that statement we may all agree. The trouble is that not many of us are doing anything about it.

5 *Theology and the Christian World Mission,* International Missionary Council, p. 15.

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE REFORMATION PERIOD

CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Chicago, Illinois

THE modern man enters readily into a discussion on the relationship between church and state, especially in those countries where disestablishment of the church is a burning question. He is hardly, if at all, aware that he uses terms and concepts that even a scholar of the Reformation age would not understand. The fundamental assumption of a distinction between church and state is itself a modern division, so modern indeed that the confines of each are even now unfixed. We shall search through reformation Europe in vain for a formula on which men could agree, and nowhere will we find a government and an ecclesiastical organization operating in harmony, without detriment to either. The period can throw much light on the origin of problems still unsolved, and probably point the way by revealing why the problems arose. At least it can give content to the terms church and state, and by comparison with the modern situation we can perceive the direction of change and development since the events of the sixteenth century.

Commonplace enough is the statement that the world before the Reformation was one, divided into temporal and spiritual hemispheres, the latter superior to the former. It may be that the strenuous and persistent efforts made in the Middle Ages to maintain unity conceal a variety of centrifugal forces. Henry IV was no mean foe for Hildebrand, nor Philip the Fair for Boniface VIII, while a Roger Bacon needed prison walls if the peace of uniformity was to be insured. We can be certain that men such as these were but crests of waves that beat at times high against the stately ship of Rome which would carry in tow the meaner, though useful, craft of civil government. Yet the ideal shone as a star through calm and storm, the ideal of one society. Holl has pointed out that the term *societas christiana* is a term neither

medieval nor Lutheran, wherefore we cannot think of a Christian society in the modern sense of the word.[1] But the Catholic idea conceived of every individual being brought into the church by baptism, and once in the system every individual was subject to the hierarchical system that culminated in the Papacy. The *respublica christiana* was no highly developed form of civil government, but "the totality of the Christian states, at the head of which stood the Emperor."[2]

Popes and emperors and kings might strive, as they did, to alter the lines of demarcation that separated their jurisdictions, but few indeed denied the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. The Emperor could stand on the pinnacle of the Christian estates, but inasmuch as they were Christian they owed allegiance to the Pope. And as the Pope asserted a superior rank due to the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal and none had successfully opposed him, common men were content to let him rule that part of the world which his temporal sovereign had not wrested from Rome. As the good Catholic believed in one, holy Catholic church in which all citizens were comprehended, his ideal was as international as the church, whereas his temporal needs were regulated by a more local, and consequently less impressive, authority. The Pope's will could make itself felt in every parish of Christendom, while the mandates of the Emperor were too mediate to concern the average burgher. A student at the university was registered by his diocese and thus bore testimony to the one effective organization of the Middle Ages—the church. English and French kings early sought to keep the papal sovereignty within bounds, but so long as Europe conceded that the Bishop of Rome had the keys of heaven and earth the power of princes was at the mercy of the real or imagined authority of Rome.

The position of Rome towards national governments today reflects accurately the age-long attitude it has maintained towards the sphere of the state. The Jesuits of the Counter Reformation were forced to deal with national governments grown strong and

1 Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I, *Luther*, 341.
2 *Ibid.*, Note 2.

independent. More than their medieval teachers they allowed a distinct sphere for the state, but they limited that field to human and utilitarian purposes. It must be a strictly secular state, and above all it must be considered as an inferior body. The church, so Bellarmin, Molina, and Saurez taught, was from above, and could exercise indirect temporal power, that is, dictate to its subjects their political action when moral issues were at stake.

Thus the church was still the superior power, allowing to the state a limited and dependent existence. In the Catholic Spain of the Counter Reformation Philip II was lord of both church and state. Yet he was not untrue to the Catholic ideal of a unity in which the church should be supreme, for he considered himself protector of the papacy and strove to bring the world back under Rome as much as he would have it under Spain. By diplomacy Pius IV had won his way to ecclesiastical supremacy at Trent, and this victory bore its fruits in the alliance that he effected with Catholic sovereigns. By instituting the policy of yielding some privileges to these monarchs, he could in turn receive their allegiance to the Papacy, and their victories over the Reformation. The Concordat had done much in stemming the tide of revolt in France at the opening of the Reformation. It became the means whereby southern Europe could be saved for the Papacy. It has become the means whereby Rome could deal with heretical nations into our own days. Underlying its operation is the Roman principle that subordinate, temporal affairs may be left to a government of the people, while the greater, spiritual interests are cared for by the church, which, when questions of morality arise, may interfere even in the affairs of the secular organization. The Jesuits and the papacy have encountered new and stronger powers since the Reformation, but they have not altered their claims that the church is one and supreme, and that secular governments can have no purposes contrary to the welfare and supremacy of the Roman church. In their view the state is from below. Men may even make their own government, just because the state is human

and temporal.[3] To the kind of government Rome is indifferent, but to its claims she is critical. Now as in medieval times the secular organization of society must subserve the visible church which is the only enduring and important organization.

If, as Figgis claims, "the supreme achievement of the Reformation is the modern State,"[4] the achievement was not realized by events in the realm of politics but by events in the church. The Reformation changed men's ideas concerning the church. The change in their ideas about government followed necessarily. Dante may have dreamt that the world might be united under the double sway of a universal empire and a universal church. After the sixteenth century no one had such visions, for the empire was shattered and the church hopelessly divided. The unity of the empire was a fiction before Luther's time. But the church was outwardly one, and not until he had broken its power could either nations or church enter on new paths of development. We may summarize the change by referring to the period before the Reformation as one in which states functioned within a church, and to the period following the Reformation as one in which churches function within states.

CHURCH AND STATE IN GERMANY

Luther was no politician. By an eminent writer on "the Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century" he is dismissed as "largely an opportunist in politics"[5] who "never cared one jot for political liberty." But as so often happens, a hero in one realm of human activity may revolutionize another in which he is no expert. So Luther was instrumental in the creation of the modern state. It was not because he presumed even to a mastery in statecraft. "As a preacher," he wrote, "and a messenger of Christ I have nothing to teach you concerning economy, agriculture, matrimony, nourishment and the like."[6] His concern with temporal affairs was entirely religious.

3 Cf. J. N. Figgis, in *Cambridge Modern History,* III, 765: "We have in fact in the Ultramontane and Jesuit theory the fundamental principles of popular sovereignty and of the secular state."

4 *Ibid.,* p. 736.

5 Figgis, *op. cit.,* p. 738.

6 Holl, *op. cit.,* p. 470, Note 1. W. A., 52, 268.

I will not give directions how it (the government) shall conduct itself in all things. I will let that be left to the reason, but I will say that in its actions love towards neighbor must be exhibited. What can I say to the tailor in teaching him about the sewing of a coat? He knows that beforehand. Only this can I tell him, to do his handiwork in a good and Christian manner. Likewise it does not become me to instruct a ruler. I will but tell him to act as a Christian. The rulers and the temporal authority should hold and wield the sword altogether in a Christian way, in that they serve, protect and govern. The temporal rule is a very extensive power, and I but direct that love alone be the object in its exercise.[7]

Luther, be it admitted, had no contribution to make to the science of pure politics.

But he did contribute something to the science of the church. And in an age when the church embraced the state something was bound to happen when the current conception of the church was undermined. The church was synonymous with the hierarchy centered in Rome. The Bishop of Rome was the vicegerent of Christ on earth. Christendom was the body of baptized adherents throughout the dioceses of the Roman hierarchy. Men saw and heard and experienced the church in its rulers and its regulations.

As he had earlier challenged the prevailing conception of the nature of religion, so by 1520 Luther challenged the current idea of the church. He drew a distinction between an inner and an outer church.

The first, which is the genuine, basic, essential and veritable, we would call a spiritual, inner Christendom. The other, which is artificial and external, we would call a bodily, external Christendom. Not that we would separate the one from the other, but even as we regard a person spiritual according to his soul and physical according to his body, or as the Apostle was wont to speak of the inner and the outer man, so the Christian congregation with reference to souls is a communion united in one faith, although physically they may not be gathered in one place even when each group is assembled in its place.[8]

With this ideal of an unseen congregation of Christians Luther could defy the vast machinery of the Roman system. Pope, cardinals, bishops, prelates, priests, monks and nuns might exist,

7 *Ibid.*, p. 472, Note 1. W. A., 10, 3.380.
8 "Von dem Papstthum zu Rom," W. A., 6, 296.

he goes on to say, even without believers. They represented but an external organization which was not at all synonymous with the church of Christ. This true church did have priests, but its priesthood was founded on the spiritual gifts implicit in Christian baptism.[9] Baptism furnished the credentials for each believer to be priest, bishop and pope, though, he adds, "it is not becoming for each one to exercise this office."[10] The priestly office is to be filled by those whom the community of believers choose to render service for them. "In Christendom the priestly rank is to be none other than that of a servant." The work of the priest is only one of many offices in Christendom. Among them is the office of the ruler, who is "a fellow-member of the Christian body."[11] Temporal are not subordinate to spiritual servants.[12] The treasures of this spiritual community were, unlike those of the visible church, intangible.[13]

As Luther implies, the ideal of the invisible, spiritual community of Christians goes back to St. Paul. It had lived through the centuries, but its weight was not felt until Luther forged out of it a weapon with which to beat down the walls of Rome's defense. Out of his own spiritual experiences he had come to a new definition of "Christian." The doctrine of the church as an invisible community of believers in the living Christ followed almost necessarily.

But now arose the problem of the relationship of this community to the existing, visible church and the temporal powers which had hitherto sustained it. Until the Diet of Worms Luther hoped that his teaching of the Word might bring about reforms

9 W. A., 6, 407: "Wir werden allesampt durch die tauff zu priestern geweyhet," he declared to the German Nobility.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 408.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 410: "Ein mitglid des Christlichen corpers."

12 *Ibid.*, p. 413: They are described as "mitchristen, mitpriest, mitgeystlich, mitmechtig in allen dingen," and their "ampt und werck, das sie von got haben ubir yederman, sol sie lassen frey gehen, wo es not und nutz is zugehen."

13 W. A., 7, 219: "Ich glaub, das yn disser gemeyne odder Christenheit alle ding gemeyn seynd und eyns jeglichen guter des andern eygen und niemant ichts eygen sey, darumb mir und eynem yglichen glaubigen alle gepett und gutte werk der gantzen gemeyne zu hülff kommen, beystehn und stercken müssen, zu aller zeyt, inn leben und sterben, und also eyn yglicher des andern pürden tregt, wie sanct Paulus leret."

within the Roman system. Despairing of any action from the Papacy, he looked to the secular rulers of Germany. But he did not advocate reform of the church by them. He urged them to do *their* duty.[14] They were ordained to preserve peace and justice, to punish wrong, to prohibit blasphemy. They were not to stop at the doors of the church, if evils had taken refuge with its walls.[15] If they did their duty, the church would be enabled to cleanse itself, especially with the calling of a council. But what right did the princes have to call a church council? It was an emergency right, within the province of Christian rulers. Rulers were to care for the public welfare. The church was driving the country to destruction. The princes were bound to stay its course. Moreover if the rulers were Christian they were members of the community of believers, partakers in the universal priesthood. As such they might act for the community, since they were so situated as to act most easily. It might seem that Luther was deceiving himself as to the character of the German princes, some of whom were quite evidently not over-supplied from the spiritual treasures of the invisible church. But as Holl shows,[16] the question is, on what grounds the princes have a right to interfere, and to this question Luther's argument is directed. But apart from a council, the government not only can, but must, stay abuses that threaten the common good, even if those abuses originate and flourish in the church.

After 1521 Luther was less concerned about the visible Roman organization, more anxious about the building up of the local congregations that had become independent of Rome. There was no question as to their charters of organization, for wherever Christians came together to hear the preaching of the Word and to receive the sacraments as instituted by the Lord, a congregation already existed. But what relation should such a group sustain

14 Cf. K. Müller, *Kirche, Gemeinde und Obrigheit Nach Luther,* pp. 19 ff.

15 "Schrift an den Adel," W. A., 6, 409: "Dieweil weltlich Gewalt von Gott geordnet ist, die Bosen zu strafen und die Frumen zu schutzen, so soll man ihr Amt lassen frei gehen unvorhindert durch den gangen Korper der Christenheit, niemands angesehen, sie treff Papst, Bischof, Pfaffen, Munch, Nonnen oder was es ist."

16 *Op. cit.,* p. 334.

to the community as a whole? On this point Luther separated from the Anabaptists. He would not have his band of believers go off as a sect to preserve their purity, but remain and serve as the salt of the community. Karlstadt's reforms he considered ill-advised and premature. For the present the old forms should be kept, and the old organization retained. The sermon should be pedagogical and all the efforts of the enlightened ought to be directed towards bringing the population into the inner group of the true Christians. In the outer, or Folk-church, the sacrament was still to be administered in one kind, but the smaller group might, in addition to attendance at the popular services, have its own gatherings for prayer, reading of Scripture, baptism and communion, the latter in both kinds. This smaller group was the kernel from which a Christian Folk-church might grow.[17] In this way Luther hoped to preserve the community or parish church, while revitalizing it from within. He feared sects too much to organize the faithful into such, and he gives one more significant reason for hesitating to form a free, "pure" church namely, "people were lacking."[18]

Manifestly this development could not go on without sanction from secular powers, or even begin, where the secular power was still Roman. How then was the congregation in each place to view the government? Again the same principles are invoked as were stated in the appeal to the German Nobility. Negatively, the ruler was to prohibit blasphemy and punish dissension. The Mass was blasphemy, and was to be suppressed by the ruler as a temporal not a spiritual measure.[19] Varieties of worship produced dissension and only one form was to be used. If Lutherans were in a minority, they were gladly to step aside and be silent.[20] If they were in majority, they would determine the form, as a civil measure. Positively, the secular authority acted not in his office as ruler but as a member of the Christian community. In Alten-

17 Cf. Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.

18 Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 360.

19 W. A., 18, 23.

20 W. A., 31, 1.209. Cited by Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 368, Note 1: "Solten auch selbs gern abtreten und schweigen, wo sie merkten, das man sie nicht gern horet."

burg,[21] for example, the *Rat* as composed of Christians, in conjunction with other Christians formed a *Gemeinde* and ordered the preaching of the Word. Property belonging to a parish or an order could be retaken by the parish, on the ground that Rome had usurped it. But in cases of patron rights, the patron ought to be urged by the prince to provide true Christian preaching, but his property could not be taken. The congregation might then call its own pastor and would have to support him. The plan suggested by Luther to the Rat of Prague[22] is an example of the way in which he thought the work of reformation would progress. In Bohemia nobility, king, and a majority of the people were opposed to the new teachings. The Rat of Prague should therefore consult with the friends of reform and together call a pastor or bishop for the community. If the community resisted or ignored his service, he became the pastor of the separatists who were nevertheless the true church. Several of these bishops could meet and elect an archbishop for Bohemia.

All too true was the statement that "people were lacking" to form a strong group of Christians who might influence the whole community and preserve the independence of the church. By 1526 it had become clear that the secular power must do more than make possible the existence of the true church. Luther's letter to Elector John of Saxony[23] tells us how necessary secular intervention was.

> There is no fear of God and no discipline any longer, for the papal ban is abolished and everyone does what he will. But because all of us, and especially the rulers, are commanded to care for the poor children who are born every day and are growing up, and to keep them in the fear of God and under discipline, we must have schools and pastors and preachers. If the older people do not want them, they may go to the devil; but if the young people are neglected and are not trained, it is the fault of the rulers, and the land will be filled with wild loose-living people. Thus not only God's command, but our own necessity compels us to find some way out of the difficulty..... It will be necessary for your Grace, as the person whom God has called to this work and entrusted with the remedy, to have the land visited

21 Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 47 ff.
22 W. A., 12, 169: "De instituendis ministris." Cf. Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 ff.
23 Smith-Jacobs, *Luther's Correspondence,* II, 383-4. Nov. 22, 1526.

as quickly as possible by four persons; two whose specialty is taxes and property, and two who are competent to pass on doctrine and character. These men, at your Grace's command, ought to have the schools and parishes set in order and provided for, where it is necessary. If there is a town or village which can do it your Grace has the power to compel it to support schools, preaching places and parishes. If they are unwilling to do this or to consider it for their own salvation's sake, then your Grace is the supreme guardian of the youth and of all who need his guardianship..... It is just like compelling them by force to contribute and to work for the building of bridges and roads, or any other of the country's needs.

It might seem as if Luther hereby entrusted the church to the secular prince, but such would be a hasty conclusion. "Schools, pastors and preachers" is the burden of the appeal. Formerly, under Roman control, these had been supplied chiefly by the monasteries. On separation from Rome, the monasteries had fallen mostly into the hands of the nobility. Since it was a major doctrine of the Reformation that the church had usurped its temporal power and privileges, there could be no complaint from Luther on the impoverishment of the church—its treasures were spiritual. But along with monastic and episcopal property went obligations to the community—obligations to educate children, care for the poor, aid the sick. These are the things Luther appeals to the Elector to provide. He is not to establish doctrine nor prescribe the contents of preaching—that the church must decide. With the increased wealth and power of the secular ruler went an increase of duties. If he fulfilled these, the church would be able to maintain and develop itself. So Luther still taught.

The Visitation, however, did become a step towards the control of the church by the civil ruler. Whether, with Müller,[24] we interpret Luther's Preface to the "Instruktion" as referring to the spiritual aspect of the Visitation, or with Holl,[25] as a protest against the assumptions of the prince, the fact remains, as stated by Holl "mit dieser Instruktion ist das landesherrliche Kirchenregiment da." Ironically enough the ruler as a member of the Christian community who was to help reform as a Christian not as a ruler because he was most ready to act, became the ruler who

24 *Op. cit.*, pp. 62 ff.
25 *Op. cit.*, pp. 373-380.

used his position to extend his secular power over the church. It became just so easy as it was desirable for him to forget the line of church independence when the consistory was set up and appointed by himself. He gave it authority and instructions, published its decrees, supervised the visitations. Despite the teaching of Luther, "with the passing of the great personalities of Luther's generation the Landesherr became virtually supreme."[26]

The principle of secular control became forthwith the law of the Empire. In 1526 the Emperor allowed, out of necessity, the Lutheran princes the right of determining the religious organization and forms in their provinces. This temporary measure of "cuius regio eius religio" was finally legalized at the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. By its operation the medieval ideal of a united visible church was shattered. Rome's power was broken, the secular rulers being quick to gather to themselves as many of the fragments as they could. Instead of a universal visible church men consoled themselves with the doctrine of the invisible church of true believers, while in their respective communities the Lutherans sought to make the visible congregation accord with the ideal. That the emerging state absorbed more of right than of corresponding duty was not the fault of the teaching of Luther, but of human nature and the course of events. It is the fruit of his teaching that the congregations maintained themselves and gradually produced a life richer than any known under the combined secular and spiritual sovereignty of Rome.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRANSFORMATION IN SWEDEN

In no country did the separation from Rome lead more directly or quickly to a national church within a state than in Sweden.[27] The spread of Reformation doctrines came just as the country was freeing itself from a century long subordination to Denmark. In 1523 Gustavus Vasa had been acclaimed king by the victorious land, and he immediately set himself the task to make the royal power supreme. While Henry VIII was earning the

26 Carew Hunt, "Luther's Theory of Church and State," in *Church Quarterly Review,* CVII (Oct. 1928), 36.

27 This section is based on the author's *Olavus Petri and the Ecclesiastical Transformation in Sweden,* 1521-1552. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1928).

title of "Defender of the Faith," Gustavus Vasa was laying the foundations of the first Protestant monarchy.

The church in Sweden had already lost power and leadership when Gustavus became king. Its archbishop, Gustav Trolle, had been an ally of the Danes and an accomplice of Christian II, at the Stockholm Massacre in 1520. That cruel king had included two of the seven bishops among his victims. Two more died in 1522, and one was so advanced in years as to be politically negligible. The remaining two were the Archbishop, now deposed, and the Bishop of Linköping, Hans Brask, who was left alone to represent the Roman church in Sweden. The alliance of the church with the Danes had alienated it from the Nationalists, and now that the latter had come to power they would look askance at any recrudescence of its political activity.

The first associates and steps of Gustavus boded no good for the party behind Brask. Laurentius Andreae, archdeacon at Strengnäs, became chancellor and Olavus Petri, preacher at Stockholm. Olavus Petri had been at Wittenberg between 1516-18, and since his return preached Lutheran doctrine at Strengnäs. The contemporary chronicler tells us that Olavus made the acquaintance of the king at the Diet of Strengnäs 1523, and preached to him that there was no Scriptural authority for the temporal power of the church. Gustavus must have heard the doctrine before, but his sympathies were revealed when he brought the two Strengnäs reformers to his court at Stockholm.

So early as in 1523 Swedish relations with the Papacy ceased. They ceased with a flourish of defiance. Adrian VI had named Francesco de Potenza to the vacant see of Skara and declared for the deposed Trolle. Both these measures roused the ire of Gustavus, who furthermore was opposed to the outgo of annates from his country, and he ended his sallies at the Pope by appealing to the "one and highest priest, Christ."

The contest between monarch and church now became an unequal duel between Gustavus and Bishop Brask. Of the few prominent churchmen whom Brask could muster to his aid, two lost their positions and later their heads on account of treasonable in-

trigue. One, Peder Jakobsson, was bishop-elect of Vesterås; the other, Knut Michaelis, archbishop-elect. Their election annulled by the king, they had sought to stir up strife but had been forced to take refuge in Norway only to fall later into the hands of the king and pay the death penalty. Meanwhile the new archbishop-elect, Johannes Magnus, had managed to incur royal displeasure because he had affected too much pomp on his visitation tour and seemed on too good terms with the archbishop of Norway. In 1526 he was in confinement, but was later allowed to go to Prussia, leaving his friend Brask still more lonely. The bishop had sought to do battle by addressing his diocese against the "Martinianos," his clergy against "Luciferan" teachings, and by translating Duke George's reply to Luther, all the time complaining to the king on the course of events. But the king rebuffed his complaints and suppressed his printing plant.

The policy of Gustavus was to shield the reformation labors of Olavus Petri with one hand and with the other build up the power and wealth of the state. In 1524 Olavus had begun his preaching in Stockholm. In 1525 the king urged a translation of the Bible into Swedish. In 1526 appeared the Protestant *An Useful Teaching* and the New Testament in Swedish. Towards the end of this year the king wanted a disputation to decide what was false and what true. Meanwhile he won his Council over to his policy against the church. At the beginning of his reign he had demanded a loan of treasure and money from churches and cloisters. In 1524 it was decided that horses might be quartered at the monasteries, and that the tithes, except what was needed for sacramental elements, should devolve to the king. At the end of the following year the king confiscated the wealthy monastery of Gripsholm. Two thirds of the parish tithes of 1526 were granted him by the Council.

Thus the way led to the Diet of Vesterås 1527 where Gustavus threatened to abdicate unless he was supported by the estates in making the crown supreme. He was irritated by the foreign debt owing Lübeck; the province of Dalarne was in disturbance; the exiled churchmen and the friends of Brask were suspected of in-

triguing to depose the king. Everywhere complaints against the new religion were heard. A final test was necessary. The Diet proved such a test, and out of it the king emerged victor. In the Vesterås *Recess* the estates promised 1) to put an end to the uprising in Dalarne; 2) to grant the king the income of the churches, bishops and canons (above what was necessary for their support), the episcopal castles, and the management of the monasteries; 3) to return to the heirs all goods given to the church after 1454; 4) to quiet complaints against a new faith, on the condition that the Word of God be preached in purity. The old order had passed; the crown was supreme over the property and power of the church. A few months after Vesterås, Bishop Brask fled to the Continent, to the protection of Poland's king. On January 12, 1528, Guståvus held his long delayed coronation service in Uppsala, with Olavus as preacher. On this day an evangelical preacher preached the coronation sermon for an evangelical king in the archiepiscopal church of Sweden.

But what of the church after Vesterås? The *Ordinantia* governing it were drawn up at Vesterås by the king and his council. If the bishop failed to provide suitable preachers in his churches the king could intervene. On presentation of an account of his income the bishop would receive his share from the crown. The clergy were to be ruled by civil law. They were forbidden to use improper pressure on the laity through ban and refusal of sacrament or in making of wills. The Gospel was to be taught in all schools. The ordination of a pastor was to depend on his ability to preach God's Word. The general policy of the king may be summed up in the words of the Council in its letter to the kingdom announcing the actions of the Diet. "We want of course that there shall be bishops, yet not so mighty that kings or the kingdom shall be in any peril from them—they can the better care for the Word of God." That the church should preach the Word of God and leave all else to the state was the principle of Gustavus Vasa.

This definition of its domain the church accepted. In February 1529 the first church Council met, attended by some forty churchmen. The king's "authorized representative," Laurentius

Andreae, was "president." The duty of the church, the council decided, was "to proclaim, propagate, and advance the Word of God." Its further decisions concerned the reading and preaching of the Word, church days and devotional practices. Within certain limits the council was free to legislate, but evidently the limits were set by the king. Naturally the choice of new bishops was a matter of interest to him. Laurentius Andreae in 1528 had informed the bishop of Strengnäs that the king wanted "evangelical" bishops, and such the new ones were. The archbishopric was vacant. In 1529 the chapter at Uppsala together with "some of the royal Council" had elected the Bishop of Finland who, however, declined. The constituency of the body that finally elected an archbishop—Laurentius Petri, brother of Olavus—in 1531 is not known, but clearly he was evangelical and acceptable to the king.

With an evangelical archbishop, a majority of evangelical bishops, and the property of the church in his control, it remained for Gustavus to reveal what his attitude would be towards an evangelical church. That he was inclined to be more radical than his advisors, Laurentius Andreae and Olavus Petri, is evident from the fact that first the one and then the other withdrew from his service. The extent of the royal control of the church was not to their liking. Even the new archbishop had to take orders from the crown. In the filling of the more important positions in his diocese he was to have the approval of the king. He was told in 1533 that "in no case shall any reformation be undertaken, before the archbishop has first consulted us as to the method and nature of the changes." In 1539 he was reproved for not having consulted more often with the king, who was concerned about the "clear and pure Word of God," and who claimed "had we not done more for it than yourselves, one might question if the matter peradventure had come so far, as it now is." "You are to be preachers not lords" was His Majesty's command. "You need not think that we shall let it occur again, that bishops shall have the sword," the archbishop was made to understand. The same control was exercised over the other dioceses, whose incumbents had to give strict accounts of their income and their actions.

In Sweden as in Germany the evangelical party complained loudly of the conditions of the schools which they felt should receive more attention from the beneficiaries of the dissolution of the monasteries. Gustavus, like the German princes, paid more attention to his rights than his duties. Both the king and the reformers realized the need of better and more preachers, but the king withheld the means for the education necessary for them. The income of the church had passed to the crown to such an extent that the material welfare of the church depended on the favor and generosity of the crown. Gustavus claimed that the economies of the kingdom did not permit the use of funds for church matters to the amount sought by the reformers. The result of course was a church subordinate to the will of the monarch, exactly as the issue had been in Germany.

Indeed the German model was so much to the king's liking that in 1539 he imported a German secretary further to reform the Swedish church. George Norman, a nobleman of Rügen, was made *ordinarius* and *super attendent,* with power to exercise the jurisdiction of the king "over bishops, prelates, and all other clergy and their subordinates, in matters of religion." The king himself, in a manifesto, assumed the title, "the highest protector of the holy Christian faith throughout the whole realm." To complete his victory, Gustavus had Laurentius and Olavus convicted of treason, though they were later pardoned. Gustavus was now supreme in state and church. He proposed to set up an elaborate organization in each province, in which a lay conservator was to be responsible for the rights and goods of the church, and two clerical *seniores* to conduct visitations, report and be subordinate to the conservator, who in turn obeyed the *superattendent.* The system, however, never got beyond its paper form, and a popular uprising caused the king to take the power more directly into his own hands again. During the rest of his reign († 1560) he appointed no new bishops, and after 1540 only those retained the title who bore it in that year. Ordinarii were appointed in the various dioceses beside or instead of the bishops. In 1560 only the archbishop remained of the consecrated bishops, so that on him depended the

apostolic succession in Sweden. The king had wanted the elimination of both the political and spiritual power of the evangelical as well as the Roman episcopacy. In 1555 and 1557 he divided the largest and most influential dioceses. Gradually the chapters disintegrated; the property of bishops and cloisters and parishes became crown possessions; and the clergy of the kingdom became functionaries of the state. Under Gustavus the church became a church within and dependent on the state.

The church in Sweden became a national church because the king who founded the nation was able to transfer to the crown the material possessions of the hierarchy and subordinate the new organization to himself. But dependence on the state did not mean defeat for the church. In fact the limiting of it to a teaching and preaching organization caused it to concentrate on the spiritual aspect, that which the Reformers taught made it a church. The Roman bishops "had wanted to make out of an ancient and free kingdom a diocese and episcopal realm for their own sole benefit" was the answer of the Swedish state to the Council of Trent. Gustavus feared that the state could never be strong if a rival organization could divide wealth and power with it. He saw no room for an independent ecclesiastical system in the nation. It might have full freedom to teach and worship and develop itself spiritually, on one vital condition—that it encouraged faithfulness and obedience to the crown. The welfare of the state must regulate even its reformation, which ought not proceed so fast as to cause rebellions and disaffection. The subordination of the church was a price paid for the building up of the nation.

It is futile to speak of an independence of a church before it has strength to stand on its own feet. The vindication of the evangelical cause in Sweden lies in the fact that it attained sufficient inner strength to seek more independence. When Calvinistic influences made themselves felt during succeeding decades, and Rome in the reign of John III sought by every artifice to gain a foothold again in Sweden, the fruits of the Reformation became evident. Very gradually the Word of God had made its way into the deep ranks of the people, but very certainly. Apart from the question

of the right of the state to control the church (a question which cannot be discussed apart from the question of the previously assumed right of the church to secular authority) it cannot be denied that the reduction of the church to a teaching organization brought it closer to its ideal purpose than before. When emergency demanded, the young church could assert its freedom. It did so against the Calvinizing influences of Charles and the Romanizing tendencies of John, and in 1593 the church was the soul of the movement that, at Uppsala, placed Sweden definitely among the evangelical states. Sweden illustrates well Luther's principle of a Folk-church in which a group of true believers gradually transforms the larger mass of the nation.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

Between Gustavus Vasa and Henry VIII are many points of resemblance, and the similarity of their treatment of the church within their realms has often been remarked. But a fundamental difference is of greater importance. Gustavus brought about an evangelical church within his kingdom. Henry VIII left a Catholic country behind him and it is questionable if he can be called anything else than a Catholic. If Luther can be called an "opportunist in politics," Henry VIII deserves the title "opportunist in religion." The Six Articles of 1539 probably represent his own religious state as well as any of his public documents. Transubstantiation, the sufficiency of communion in one kind, the necessity of private masses, auricular confession, celibacy of clergy, and the perpetual obligation of vows of chastity—if these articles were for the "abolishing of diversity of opinion," they also express the opinion of one on whom the doctrinal reformation had made little impress. And when we are told that "not a single bishop doubted yet of transubstantiation,"[28] we realize how much slower the Reformation was progressing in England[29] than in Sweden and Germany.

28 H. M. Gwatkin, *Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne*, p. 175.

29 Cf. J. Gairdner, *English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 50-58. Between 1510-27 but forty cases of heresy are recorded in the See of London, and all forty abjured.

But though the reign of Henry presents neither an evangelical church nor evangelical state, it is noteworthy in the history of the relations between the two in that the English king transferred to himself the supremacy of the church. Even this act, however, may be viewed as belonging to medieval rather than reformation history, for it is much more in the spirit of Henry IV at Canossa than of Luther at Worms. The Praemunire Statutes which Henry used with such good effect were old in England, and as for royal supremacy, Henry in 1515 had answered Wolsey's plea for an appeal to Rome, "We are by God's grace king of England, and have no superior but God; we will maintain the rights of the crown like our predecessors."[30] Gwatkin indeed sees in the series of acts that culminated in the Parliamentary acts of 1534 only a return to the position of William the Conqueror. "So far all that had been done was to sweep away the papal encroachments of the last four hundred years, and to replace the divided rule of Pope and King by a single authority."[31] The English king assumed the title "Only Supreme Head of the Church," the Swedish king, "The Highest Protector of the holy Christian faith throughout the whole realm." In the latter case a change of religion was implied, in the former only a change of constitution. It is conceivable that England could have become as independent of the Roman See under Henry as Spain was under Philip II and yet remain Catholic. That she did not do so was the result of the work of other men than Henry VIII. The Reformation found England with a church as greatly under royal supremacy as the church in Sweden became after the Reformation.

Given, therefore, an absolute sovereignty in England, the principal of cuius regio eius religio might have been active there as in Germany, and superficially this seems to be the case in the successive changes from Henry to Edward to Mary to Elizabeth. But in England Parliament had to be reckoned with to a far greater degree than the estates in Germany or Sweden. In the transition of England from an agrarian to a commercial nation under the Tudors, Parliament had become ever more hostile to the clerical

30 S. R. Gardiner, *A Student's History of England*, p. 377.
31 *Op. cit.*, pp. 155-156.

dominion of the church, and was ready to follow Henry because his course was to the advantage of England. In 1515 the Bishop of London complained to Wolsey, "For assured am I if my chancellor be tried by any twelve men in London, they be so maliciously set in favorem haeretical pravitatis that they will cast and condemn any clerk, though he were as innocent as Abel."[32] When aversion to clerics was coupled with eager patriotism the spirit of Parliament was ready for the demands of a king who wanted to break with Rome. But in the latter part of Henry's reign those convictions began to spread which had a religious rather than insular motive. From commercial centers in London, from cultural centers in Cambridge, and from the translation of the Bible into English as well as from the importation of Lutheran literature, came the impetus for a religious reformation. After Wolsey's fall Henry showed passivity towards heresy, and heresy became more common. The nation was gradually learning to see that reformation meant more than the denial of the supremacy of the Pope. Though we may not regard the acts of Somerset's first parliament, in 1547—abolishing heresy laws, the Six Articles, and restrictions on printing, reading, and teaching the Bible—as the will of the nation, we can at least give them as much popular weight as the acts of Henry's parliaments. And certainly the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, though the work mainly of Cranmer, represent a great progress in the popular reformation.

Even apart from Mary, a reaction to the measures of Cranmer might have been expected, for they were too rapid and too radical. But that they were in the main in the direction desired by the country is evident from the popular resistance to this Catholic queen. The number and character of her victims attested the reality of an evangelical spirit in the land. Though she might burn seventy or eighty heretics a year, and claim such victims as Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer, her efforts were in vain. For she "only burned into the character of the English people a fierce and enduring hatred of the Pope and all his works."[33] and drove into

32 Gairdner, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
33 Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

exile men who returned with fiercer zeal and more radical measures.

It is really first under Elizabeth that the enduring effect of the Reformation on the English church becomes clear. She rather than her father settled the relationship between church and state, in its broadest lines. Her position was one of compromise between the old and the new. How little the clergy were inclined to the new may be seen from the fact that in February 1559, "Convocation under Bonner's guidance passed unanimously Articles maintaining transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the supremacy of the Pope, and the incompetence of laymen to meddle with faith, sacraments, and discipline."[34] How deeply rooted the new was, the extent to which the Queen went, clearly shows. Instead of her father's title she chose to bear that of Supreme Governor. Jurisdiction over the church she exercised through an Ecclesiastical Commission, to which she appointed Parker, Grindall, Bell, with eight lawyers and eight other laymen. This Commission acted as supreme Visitor, ignored Convocation and was independent of Parliament. A Uniformity Bill was passed and the Visitors given Injunctions to enforce the Act. In the main they brought the church up to the level indicated by the reforms of Cranmer—another proof that he had sensed rightly the will of the nation.

"Even Henry scarcely asserted more strongly than Elizabeth the principle of English law, that the competence of Parliament covers faith and discipline without regard to Convocation. The reform was not carried out with the assent of the church, but the state took the church in hand and reformed it against its will."[35] So Gwatkin describes the settlement of Elizabeth, indicating that the source of power was Parliament. The English church was thus ruled as a part of the English nation—the church was one aspect of the national life. Because of this we may expect, and we find, that the further development of the Reformation in England is reflected in, nay staged almost, in Parliament. There the contest between Puritanism and Uniformity was decided, though lead-

34 *Ibid.*, p. 221.
35 *Ibid.*, p. 225.

ing to civil war. Because church and state were one, a religious issue must perforce become a national issue.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CONCEPTION

In Germany, the Landesherr; in Sweden, the Monarch; in England, Parliament, secured the power over the church. The Consistory, the Ordinarii, the Ecclesiastical Commission, each represent secular control of religion and religious organization. In each case the liberty of the church was restricted within vague or undefined limits. Rome had usurped rights and authority. The secular power recaptured from Rome those rights and authorities. But which of them belonged inherently to the church? The sixteenth century gave no clear nor definite reply through the Lutheran or Angelican communities.

But did not Calvin have clear ideas as to the connection of church and state? it may be asked. And the reply must be that none of the reformers wrote more logically nor experimented more earnestly than he in this problem. The conclusion he came to needs consideration, even if it cannot command acceptance.

As Luther, so Calvin saw in the temporal power an agency of God, with sanction in the Scriptures. Magistrates "have a commission from God—they are invested with divine authority—they represent the person of God, as whose substitutes they in a manner act."[36] Luther left the affairs of civil government to the reason. "To the ordering of earthly affairs, the reason, which is given by God, is sufficient, so that herein the Holy Spirit is not necessary."[37] Calvin saw a more direct influence of God in government. "It is evident that the law of God which we call moral, is nothing else than the testimony of natural law and of that conscience which God has engraven on the minds of men."[38] "Supreme power is lodged in kings and other governors—by Divine Providence, and the holy decree of Him to whom it has seemed good so to govern the affairs of men, since he is present, and also presides in enacting laws and

36 *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. by H. Beveridge (Edinburgh, 1846) III, Bk. IV, Ch. 20, p. 523.

37 W. A., 50, 553. Cited by Holl, p. 472, Note 2.

38 *Institutes*, p. 538.

exercising judicial equity."[39] Luther gave the temporal power its domain in which it was responsible to God. Calvin interpreted the exercise of civil authority as the exercise of the will of God. "If we understand that the magistrate, in inflicting punishment, acts not of himself but executes the very judgments of God, we shall be disencumbered of every doubt.—I wish it could always be present to our mind, that nothing is done here by the rashness of man, but all in obedience to the authority of God."[40]

Such a government must, naturally, at all times be obeyed. "If we have respect to the Word of God, it will lead us farther, and make us subjects not only to the authority of those princes who honestly and faithfully perform their duty toward us, but all princes, by whatever means they have so become.—Even an individual of the worst character, one most unworthy of all honor, if invested with public authority, receives that illustrious divine power which the Lord has by his word devolved on the ministers of his justice and judgment, and—in so far as public obedience is concerned, he is to be held in the same honour and reverence as the best of kings."[41] Man may not even attempt to change an undesirable form of government. "And certainly it were a very idle occupation for private men to discuss what would be the best form of polity in the place where they live, seeing these deliberations cannot have any influence in determining any public matter.—Should those to whom the Lord has assigned one form of government, take it upon them anxiously to long or a change, the wish would not only be foolish and superfluous, but very pernicious.—For it has pleased him (God) to appoint kings over kingdoms, and senators or burgomasters over free states; whatever be the form which he has appointed in the places in which we live, our duty is to obey and submit."[42] And if we ask, why then evil rulers? Calvin replies: "If we are cruelly tormented by a savage, if we are rapaciously pillaged by an avaricious or luxurious, if we are neglected by a sluggish, if, in short, we are persecuted for righteousness' sake by an impious

39 *Ibid.*, p. 523.
40 *Ibid.*, p. 531.
41 *Ibid.*, p. 546-7.
42 *Ibid.*, p. 527-8

and sacrilegious prince, let us first call up the remembrance of our faults, which doubtless the Lord is chastising by such scourges. In this way humility will curb our impatience. And let us reflect that it belongs not to us to cure these evils, that all that remains for us is to implore the help of the Lord, in whose hands are the hearts of kings, and inclinations of kingdoms."[43]

To the church the temporal government has a very close relationship. To it "is assigned, so long as we live among men, to foster and maintain the external worship of God, to defend sound doctrine and the condition of the church, to adapt our conduct to human society, to form our manners to civil justice, to conciliate us to each other, to cherish common peace and tranquillity."[44] The object of civil government is "in short, that a public form of religion may exist among Christians, and humanity among men."[45] There can be no doubt as to the prime purpose of the state. All philosophers who have written on government "have confessed that no polity can be successfully established unless piety be its first care, and that those laws are absurd which disregard the rights of God, and consult only for men."[46] And the method of operation is equally clearly stated. "For, seeing the church has not, and ought not to wish to have, the power of compulsion (I speak of civil coercion) it is the part of pious kings and princes to maintain religion by laws, edicts, and sentences."[47] And how were those to be considered who did not wish to be maintained religiously by the state? "Such is the value which the Lord sets on the communion of his church, that all who contumaciously alienate themselves from any Christian society, in which the true ministry of his word and sacraments is maintained, he regards as deserters of religion.—Revolt from the church is denial of God and Christ. Wherefore there is the more necessity to beware of a dissent so iniquitous· for seeing by it we aim as far as in us lies at the destruction of God's truth, we deserve to be crushed by the full thunder of his

43 *Ibid.*, p. 551.
44 *Ibid.*, p. 521.
45 *Ibid.*, p. 522.
46 *Ibid.*, p. 529.
47 *Ibid.*, Ch. XI, p. 244.

anger. No crime can be imagined more atrocious than that of sacrilegiously and perfidiously violating the sacred marriage which the only begotten Son of God has condescended to contract with us."[48]

With such ideas and ideals Calvin came to Geneva. Cornelius[49] has shown that the revolution in the Genevan government was in reality an arrangement between Calvin and the constituted authority, the burghers having no part therein. Consequently Calvin could feel that he was upsetting no divinely appointed government, but that he was doing the work of God in the established form, which we have seen in his words only God could change. His aim was to aid the secular power to fulfil its duty—"to maintain religion by laws, edicts and sentences." But he did not "allow men at pleasure to enact laws concerning religion and the worship of God."[50] The fixing of doctrine and the preaching belonged to the venerable company of preachers. What Calvin wanted of the state was the enforcement of the discipline of the church. This was won in the establishment of the Consistory. It was composed of Twelve Elders elected by the Small Council—which selected two from itself, four from the Council of Sixty and six from the Great Council—and indorsed by the Great Council. Only in exceptional cases were the members changed at the end of the year, and as the preachers met with them each Thursday to exercise discipline over the people of Geneva it is easy to see that the Consistory would become a closed body under clerical influence. The Rat placed an officer at its disposal, to summon any one called before the Consistory, and when preachers and Consistory reported their findings to the Rat the latter prescribed and enforced the punishment. The Consistory could go to the limit of excommunication. In this manner the civil government became the instrument of the church, and dependent on its direction. The Roman theory of the church had found an evangelical counterpart. "There is no substantial difference between the political claims of the developed Presby-

48 *Institutes,* Vol. III, Bk. IV, Ch. 1, p. 22.
49 C. A. Cornelius, *Historische Arbeiten* (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 353 ff.
50 *Institutes,* Vol. III, Bk. IV, Ch. 20, p. 522.

terian system of Scotland and those of Rome, except that the actual constitution of the former was democratic, and the true depositories of power were an oligarchy of preachers instead of a Curia with centuries of diplomatic traditions to guide it"[51] As against Zwingli who would make the church a state, Calvin would place the church above the state, recognizing their independence but subordinating in Roman fashion the temporal to the spiritual.

The Reformation destroyed the medieval, Roman conception of a universal, visible church. The dissolution of the Empire and the development of national states forced each nation to consider anew its relation to the organization of the Christians in their lands. As yet none conceived of the possibility of a state harboring different creeds within its limits, though France made a start in this direction by the Edict of Nantes. But something was gained by the recognition of the principle that different states might hold different creeds, allowing thus the non-conformist to migrate. Heresy practically ceased to have a death penalty, even if banishment might be almost as severe. Once the idea was admitted that there could be different churches in Christendom, a return to the papacy became hopeless, and the problem became one of regulating the church within the state.

We have reviewed the various results. No uniform practice resulted. Local conditions determined the destiny of the organization inherited by the states from Rome. Generally stated, it may be said that in Presbyterian countries violence was done to the state, in the Lutheran and Anglican communions, the church was unjustly dealt with. The centuries since the Reformation have witnessed a great development in the realm of the theory of the state. The church has not experienced a similar development. The result is that the confines of the two are yet undetermined. In England and in Sweden the status of the church, or churches, is in dispute. In the United States the church is accused of entering the domain of the state. Everywhere Rome seeks to assert its ancient prerogatives. The problem is still unsolved. With Figgis[52]

51 J. N. Figgis in *Cambridge Modern History*, III, 753.
52 *Op. cit.*, p. 768.

we may say, "It is not to be denied that the fundamental principle of ecclesiastical protagonists, the recognition of other societies beyond the state, so far from being an unwarrantable encroachment on civil rights, is the best preservative against the practical dangers which may, and sometimes do, follow an acceptance of the undiluted conception of legal sovereignty.—For the true conception of the state it is needed first to realize the idea of sovereignty, and afterwards to realize its practical limitations." Only we would add, for the true conception of the church it is needed to realize the idea of Christian religion, and afterwards its practical applications.

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY AND LIFE[1]

JOHN FREDERICK KRUEGER
Springfield, Ohio

THE Roman Catholic theologian Gueranger[2] characterizes Protestantism as the "anti-liturgical heresy." Another writer of the same church[3] applies this term approvingly to the Lutheran church and substantiates this statement by saying: "Still more characteristic than the juridic theory of justification is for it (Lutheranism) the rejection of the sacrifice, i. e. of the liturgy in the sense of the ancient church, and the denial of a separate office of the liturgist, by which the Old and New Testaments understood mediatorial persons, and not only representatives of the people or even preachers." If these words are a correct definition of liturgics and the liturgist, we are more than willing to concede that Lutheranism is indeed the "anti-liturgical heresy."

If, on the other hand, the liturgist is not the mediatorial priest standing in persona Christi between the congregation and God, repeating in an unbloody manner the bloody sacrifice of Calvary, but rather the servant of God, belonging to the universal priesthood of believers, called by his Lord for the office of the ministry, conducting the worship of the congregation according to ancient and established forms, then we have a right to say that the Lutheran church from its very inception has been a liturgical church.

This attitude is regarded by some as the greatest weakness of the Church of the Reformation. The Lutheran liturgy represents to them fossilized, and petrified, Lutheranism, dead formalism without a soul, perhaps even an undesirable remnant of Roman Catholicism.

1 Inaugural address, Dec. 10, 1929, on the occasion of the author's induction as professor of practical theology in Hamma Divinity School.

2 *Institutions liturgiques* (1840).

3 Valentin Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik* (1912), I, p. 137.

Others, however feel inclined to apply to the Lutheran liturgy the inspiring words of James Russell Lowell:

> Chants, that a thousand years have heard,
> I love to hear again,
> For visions of the olden times
> Are wakened by the strain;
> With gorgeous hues the window-glass
> Seems suddenly to glow,
> And rich and red the streams of light
> Down through the chancel flow.

A study of the Lutheran Liturgy and Life will enable us to assign a proper place to the liturgy of our church.

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY IS AN OUTGROWTH AND AN EXPRESSION OF THE LIFE OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH

The entire cultus of Christ and of apostolic Christendom marks a complete change from the Old Testament conception of worship. As the object of the Old Testament service of God we behold Jehovah, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, surrounded by cherubim, crying to one another: "Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts." On the day for the temple service, at the rising of the sun, before the morning sacrifice was offered to the Lord, the people were reminded of this solemn fact by the repetition of the sacred words of the Shema: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord."[4]

A holy and righteous God, unapproachable to his people, necessitated the appointment of the office of the priest, arrayed in gorgeous garments, bearing the breastplate on his heart, wearing the holy crown on his head—the mitre with its golden plate bearing the significant inscription: "Holy to Jehovah"; and of the high-priest, to whom alone was given the right to enter the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement, and to make satisfaction for the sins of the people, the priests and himself. It was the function of this office to stand in a mediatorial relationship between a holy God and an unholy people. The priest was "the vehicle of divine grace, the mediator through whose ministry the sins of the community,

4 Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num. 15:37-41.

as of the individual, could be atoned for." The decision of rabbis declared logically that "the priests were the emissaries not of the people, but of God," so that even their garments were efficacious in atoning for sin.[5]

For the performance of this sacred task, which separated the priest from the people, the מזבח, the θυσιαστήριον, the Old Testament altar, the place of slaughter, the place of sacrifice, was absolutely essential. Of the altar it could be said: "It wipes away sin; it nourishes the higher man; it fosters love to God; and it atones for all guilt."[6]

The idea of the מזבח, the θυσιαστήριον, included the conception of a divinely appointed ceremonial worship, unalterably prescribed in its minutest details by Jehovah himself. To the entire law of God, including the ceremonial, the fearful curse was attached: "If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, JEHOVAH THY GOD; then Jehovah will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sickness and of long continuance."[7]

This conception of the Old Testament λειτυργία was completely and definitely set aside by Christ. While the Master fully recognized the worship of the Old Testament with its God-given forms as a necessary part of the plan of the Almighty in the preparatory training of his chosen people, yet after all it was for him only the shadow of good things to come. And therefore he, "a priest forever after the order of Melchisedek,"[8] a high-priest who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens," appeared "once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."[10] Having thus entered into the Holy of Holies not made with hands, he "ever liveth to make in-

5 *The Jewish Encyclopaedia,* X, 195.
6 Ket. 10 b.
7 Deut. 28:58-59.
8 Heb. 7:17.
9 Heb. 7:26.
10 Heb. 9:26.

tercession for us."[11] In other words, with him and through him, the eternal high-priest, the mediatorial office of the priesthood is abolished and in its place appears the universal priesthood of believers, and the office of the ministry proceeding from the universal priesthood.

With the Old Testament priesthood the Old Testament altar disappears. The word θυσιαστήριον is used in the New Testament only with reference to the Old Testament altar, except in one passage, Hebrews 13:10: "We have an altar (θυσιαστήριον), whereof they have no right to eat that serve the tabernacle." This altar is the cross of Christ, of him who has become our high-priest (ἀρχιερεύς), as well as the sacrifice (θυσία).

New Testament liturgics, however, not only does away with the Old Testament cult; it also introduces a new positive principle of worship which finds its fullest expression in the words which Christ addressed to the woman at Jacob's well: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father..... But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and truth."[12] These words contain the heart of New Testament liturgics, from which life flows into the body of Christ, his church. Not outward ceremonies, not even a divinely appointed liturgy, forms and rituals given by the Almighty are the essence of New Testament worship, but the free, living and life-giving relationship in spirit and in truth with a Father in heaven, who is Spirit, who is truth. This definition of New Testament liturgics, as laid down by Christ, does not, of course, destroy or do away with forms and ceremonies in worship. It merely replaces dead and meaningless forms by living intercourse with God. It demands that all liturgical worship, no matter how it may be expressed, must be judged by its spiritual content, its possibility to produce true and spiritual life. According to this standard an

11 Heb. 7:25.
12 John 4:21, 23-24.

elaborate liturgy which expresses spiritual life and produces spiritual life may embody most clearly New Testament liturgical principles, while a worship which rejects all forms and which lacks life may become dead formalism.

It was this principle which found expression in the worship of the early Christian congregation, a worship which certainly did not lack all semblance of order, but which was based upon a well recognized order brought about in the congregation by the life-giving Spirit of God, and throbbing with life. The application of this principle made it possible for the early Christian church to retain even certain elements of the service of the synagogue which did not conflict with the Christian idea of worship: the reading of the Scripture lesson, psalms, prayers with the responding Amen of the people, and preaching. Paul sums up this idea when he says: "When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation,"[13] a passage which leads Strack and Zoeckler to say: "Perhaps an order of service as found in the usual arrangement of the worship of the congregation."

The Lutheran liturgical reform of the sixteenth century is a return to the principles of Christ and of the early church, and therefore we have a right to present the second proposition:

THE LUTHERAN LITURGY IS THE PULSE-BEAT OF THE LIFE OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Thalhofer makes the significant statement: "In the liturgy beats the life-pulse of the Catholic church and of all Catholic life."[14] The correctness of this assertion is brought out very clearly in the period beginning with the post-Apostolic age and with the Reformation.

During the first two centuries there is no intimation that the term "sacerdos" is applied to the clergy. The congregation still constitutes the priesthood of believers; the idea of a special sacrifice offered by a divinely appointed priesthood does not exist.

13 I Cor. 14:26.
14 *Op. cit.*, I, 60.

Justin gives expression to this idea when he says: "We are the true high-priestly people of God, as God himself witnesses, saying, that in every place among the people who offer well-pleasing sacrifices, God accepts the sacrifices of none except through his priests."[15] Tertullian still emphasizes the universal priesthood, and yet he refers to the mediatorial character of the prayer of the priest and applies the term "summus episcopus" to the bishop. Gradually it became customary in the church to designate bishops and presbyters as sacerdotes. Cyprian places the priesthood of believers definitely into the background and transfers the idea of the levitical and Aaronitic priesthood to the priests. *They* are the representatives of God, *they* offer the sacrifices, consisting not merely of prayers but of the elements of the eucharist. How deeply this conception had entered into the consciousness of the church, may be seen from the words of the prayer in the Apostolic Constitutions uttered at the ordination of a bishop.

> Thou who from the beginning has ordained priests for the guidance of the people ...., Thou who hast never left thy holy place without priests (ἀλειτούργητον), pour out at this time also the power of Thy Spirit of governance and give to this Thy servant whom Thou hast elected a bishop unto Thyself, that he may be Thy high-priest (ἀριχερατεύειν σοι), administer without blemish by day and by night the holy liturgy, reconcile Thy countenance and offer unto Thee the gifts of Thy church, the pure and unbloody sacrifice, the mystery of the New Testament.[16]

Naturally the idea of a special priesthood found expression in the conception of the sacrifice. The Apostolic Constitutions have definitely adopted the θυσιαστήριον, gifts are brought πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον; the representatives of the church are παρεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ (those who are attending the place of sacrifice). This, of necessity, led to the idea of the third century that the New Testament sacerdos not only presents to the Almighty the gifts of the people, but the gifts for the people, i. e. that he becomes the mediator between God and man. The priests become "dispensatores Dei," "judices vice Christi, sacerdotes Christi."[17]

15 *Dial.* 116.
16 *Apostolic Constitutions,* VIII, 5.
17 Cyprian *ep.* 595.

Clearly and definitely this conception is contained in the Roman liturgy. The very place at which the liturgy is conducted calls this fact to our attention. The altar as the θυσιαστήριον must be consecrated by the bishop and without this consecration the Mass is not valid; a railing must separate the holy place from the nave; holy garments must be worn by the priest to set him aside from the people, and above all things the bloody sacrifice of Calvary must be repeated in an unbloody manner by the priest. The universal priesthood of believers disappears completely and its place is taken by a special priesthood. The priest becomes an *alter Christus, the creator Creatoris.* It is not inconsistent to apply to him the words: "Le prêtre un autre Jésus Christ."[18]

The Ordo and Canon Missae are built up upon these ideas. In the very introductory part the priest must "prepare himself carefully for the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass, in which he does not only pray in a mediatorial capacity, but also offers in the consecration the mysterious act of sacrifice (the tremendum sacrificium) and partakes in the communion of the most blessed sacrifical meal of the New Testament."[19] The different parts of the Canon of the Mass have a direct relationship to the sacrifice; in fact without this conception the Mass would lose its entire significance. The oratio super oblata (Sacramentary of Gregory) or secreta (Gelasianum) express the idea that the priest utters these prayers not merely as the representative of the people, but as the mediator. In the Sanctus and Benedictus the joy of the Christian over the coming of Christ in the transubstantiation finds expression, and this idea culminates in the act of consecration, in which the priest speaks not only *nomine ecclesiae,* but *nomine Christi,* as the visible representative of Christ.

This conception of Roman Catholic liturgics is a direct negation of the liturgical principles of Christ, and therefore the reformers of the sixteenth century found themselves confronted by a twofold task: (1) the necessity of abandoning liturgical ideas

18 Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man,* p. 113: "I once heard it announced literally at a first mass, 'Le prêtre un autre Jésus Christ.'"

19 Thalhofer, *op. cit.,* II, 34.

opposed to the New Testament; (2) the necessity of reaffirming New Testament liturgical ideas. And therefore we have a right to say that in the Lutheran liturgy we feel the pulse-beat of the life of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

The living and life-giving heart-throb of Lutheran liturgics of the Reformation period finds expression in the fundamental principle that all liturgical worship must center around the Word of God and not around the sacrifice of the Mass. By proclaiming this revolutionary view Luther with one majestic stroke overthrew the entire man-made Judaizing system of Roman Catholicism and replaced it by the God-made New Testament conception that God is Spirit and that they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. As early as 1516 in the discussion of the third commandment (published in Latin in 1518), he emphasizes the necessity of "audire verbum." In his "Sermon Concerning the New Testament" of 1520 he stresses the necessity of the sermon as an explanation of the Mass. In his eight sermons in the Pfarrkirche in Wittenberg (1521), directed against the Zwickau prophets, he proclaims the conviction that the Mass can be, and must be, abolished only through the Word. In his tract "Of the Order of Divine Worship in the Congregation" (Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts in der Gemeine, 1523), a tract of which Kliefoth says: "In this first word, which was uttered by the Lutheran Church on matters of divine worship, lie its principles in full," Luther definitely develops his ideas with regard to the central position which he wishes to assign the Word of God. "The Christian congregation," he writes, "shall never assemble, unless the *Word of God be preached* and prayers be offered, even though this be done very briefly."[20] And in concluding his discussion he states clearly and concisely:

> There are other things which will shape themselves in the course of time, but the chief thing is that everything be done in such manner, that *the Word of God may have free course,* and not again become a howl and a sound as it heretofore has been. It were better *that everything else were abandoned*

20 W. A., 12, 35: "Dass die Christliche gemeyne nymer soll zu sammen komen, es werde denn daselbs Gottes wort gepredigt und gebett, es sey auffs kurtzist."

rather than the Word. For that it should have free course among Christians the whole Scripture shows and Christ himself said, Luke X: 'One thing is needful,' namely, that Mary should sit at Christ's feet and hear His Word daily, which is that best part which she has chosen, and which shall never be taken away from her. There is one eternal Word. Everything else must pass away no matter how much concern it may cause Martha. To this may God help us. Amen[21]

All principles pertaining to Lutheran liturgics must be considered from this central conception. In his reformation of the Mass, and its adaptation to the Lutheran service, the reformer places himself firmly upon the life-giving Word. Christ, having by his own blood entered in once in the holy place, has obtained eternal redemption for us. What need is there then for a repetition of this sacrifice in the Mass? Indignantly Luther exclaims: "I hold .... that the Papistic priesthood and sacrifice of the Mass are most assuredly the work of the devil, by which he has led the world into error and deceived it."[22] When his opponents called his attention to the fact that the great teachers of the church had regarded the Mass as a sacrifice, he boldly swept aside man-made ideas and put into their place the eternal thus-saith-the-Lord: "Again they call our attention to the holy fathers, who have used this canon and have considered the Mass as a sacrifice, as Gregory, Bernhardus, Bonaventura and others. To this I reply, that nothing is more terrible than the work and life of the saints, which are not founded upon the Scriptures."[23]

21 W. A., 12, 37: "Anders mehr wirt sich mit der tzeyt selb geben, wenn es angehet. Aber die Summa sey die, das ia alles geschehe, das das wort ym schwang gehe und nicht widderumb eyn loren und dohnen drauss werde, wie bisher gewesen ist. Es ist alles besser nach gelassen, denn das wort. Und ist nichts besser getrieben denn das wort. Denn das das selb sollt ym schwang unter den Christen gehen, tzeygt die gantze schrifft an, und Christus auch selb sagt, Luce X 'Eyns ist von notten.' Nemlich das Maria tzu Christus fussen sitze und hore seyn wort teglich, das ist das beste teyl, das zurwelen ist, und nymer weg genomen wirt. Est is eyn ewig wort, das ander muss alles vergehen, wie viel es auch der Martha zuschaffen gibt. Dazu helff uns Gott. Amen."

W. A., 8, 499, Vom Missbrauch der Messe: "Ich halt .... dass diss Bepstisch priesterthum und Mess opffern gewisslich der teuffels werk sey, damit er die wellt ynn Yrrthum gefurt und betrogen hat."

23 *Ibid.*, p. 527: "Zum andern, werffen sie uns fur die heyligen vetter, welche diesen Canon gebraucht und die mess fur eyn opffer gehalden haben, als Gregorius, Bernhardus, Bonaventura und andere mehr. Dazu anttwortte ich, das nichts ferlicher is, denn der heylgen werk und leben, die nicht in der schrifft gegrundet sind."

The abolition of the sacrifice of the Mass resulted naturally in the setting aside of the special office of the mediatorial priesthood and the restoration of the biblical idea of the universal priesthood of believers. As early as 1521 Luther wrote: "First of all we desire to deal with the priesthood in order that every true Christian may know that there is no external visible priest in the New Testament, except those whom the devil has raised up and instituted through the lies of men. We have only one universal priest, Christ, who has offered himself for us and all of us with him." (Reference is made to I Pet. 3 and Heb. 10). Boldly he confronts the Roman church with the challenge: "You noble priests, show us one jot or one line in all the gospels and epistles of the apostles, indicating that you are more, or that you are to be called priests for other Christians, or that your priesthood is something else than that which is common to all Christians."[24] And from all this he draws the conclusion: "This is a spiritual priesthood, which is common to all, through which all of us are priests with God, namely, we are children of Christ, the highest priest, neither do we need another priest or mediator beside Christ."[25]

The consideration of the activity of Luther in rejecting all liturgical ideas which did not harmonize with the Word of God might lead us to draw the conclusion of Gottschick that "Luther showed little interest in liturgics,"[26] or that of Franz Rendtorff, a modern authority on liturgics, that Luther was "un-liturgical" or even "anti-liturgical."[27] However, a study of the positive liturgical ideas of the reformer, expressed through his writings and actual reforms, will show that this conception is not correct.

While, on the one hand, Luther was eager to cleanse the

24 *Ibid.*, p. 488: "Ihr edlen pfaffen, tzeygt uns eyn punctel odder eyn strichel ynn allen Evengelien oder Episteln der Aposteln, dass yhr seyth, oder sollt priester anders seyn, denn das gemeyn aller Christen priesterthum."

25 *Ibid.*, p. 486: "Dies ist eyn geystlich priesterthum, allen Christen gemeyn, da durch wyr alle mit Christo priester sind, das ist, wyr sind kinder Christi, des hochsten priesters, wir durffen auch keyns andern priesters oder mittlers denn Christum."

26 J. Gottschick, *Luthers Anschauungen vom christlichen Gottesdienst* (1887), p. 31 *Ibid.*, p. 37: "wie bisher gewonnet Messz und Vesper singen."

27 *Die Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes unter dem Gesichtspunkt der liturgischen Erbfolge.*

liturgy from the dross which in the course of centuries had been mingled with it, he refrained, on the other hand, from using iconoclastic methods and gladly retained the grains of gold found in it. From his earliest reformatory period he gives expression to this idea. On January 29, 1523, he had given promise to the congregation at Leisning "to arrange an order, to sing, to pray, and to read."[28] When this church introduced radical reforms, doing away with robes and clerical garments, while the pastor administered communion "slecht im rock," i. e. simply in his every-day clothing, the order was issued in 1529 that it would be advisable for this congregation to return to the conservative practice of Wittenberg.[29]

This constructive conservatism as a life principle of the liturgical conception of Luther finds expression time and again. "Just as we do not do away with the office of the ministry, but rather desire to bring it back to its rightful position," he says, "thus it is not our opinion to do away with the service, but to restore it to its rightful place."[30] He admonishes the congregations "according to former usage to sing Mass and Vespers,"[31] to retain "hymns during the Sunday Mass, for they are good and taken from the Scriptures, although they may be shortened or lengthened."[32]

The Baptismal Book in German appeared in 1523. It was practically a translation of the liturgical forms used in Wittenberg.[33] During the same year there was published his Baptismal Liturgy.[34]

Early in 1523 Luther had also written to his friend, Nicolaus Hausmann, who on several occasions had asked for an order of service: "For a long time I have thought of prescribing a form for conducting the Mass and the communion, but I have not, up to

28 W. A., 12, 31.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

30 W. A., 12, 35-7, Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts in der Gemeine: "widder yn rechten schwang zu setzen."

31 *Ibid.*, p. 37: "wie bisher gewonnet Messz und Vesper singen."

32 *Ibid.*, p. 37: "Das gesenge ynn den sontags messen las man bleyben, denn sie sind fast gutt und aus der schrifft gezogen, doch man mags wenigen odder mehren."

33 *Ibid.*, pp. 38 ff.

34 *Ibid.*, pp. 51-2.

the present time, been able to carry it out."[35] Shortly afterwards he wrote that "in the near future he would publish something, through which he would describe the form of conducting the service."[36] Finally, on December 4, 1523, he sent the complete order to Hausmann in Zwickau.[37]

Instead of saying that Luther was *unliturgical* or *anti-liturgical,* we have a right to say that from the very beginning of his reformatory activity he was enthusiastically liturgical. At the same time his enthusiasm was tempered by conservatism. He never overlooked the fact that a liturgy will become nothing but dead formalism unless it expresses the life of the church.

Consequently all Lutheran liturgical practices must be based upon Christian liberty. They are not chains which hold consciences captive, but the free expression of the soul liberated by the Gospel. They are not laws of the church made binding upon the child of God, but expressions of the free service of the congregation worshipping God in spirit and in truth. "This is our opinion with regard to the Mass," he declares. "In all these things we must watch carefully that we do not make a law out of liberty, or feel that those are sinning who either do things differently, or omit some things, just so that the words of preaching remain inviolate and these things be done through faith."[38]

At the same time he was anxious to safeguard this position in order that liberty might not be changed into license. True liturgical liberty includes three principles:

(1) Fundamental doctrines cannot be judged by the law of liberty. Any part of the liturgy which is contrary to the Word of God is eo ipso condemned. In applying this principle to the Mass he says:

> That they make a sacrifice out of it (the Mass) does not merely mean that they make a ceremony out of it, but that they change completely and

35 "Ego diu meditatus sum formam missandi et communicandi prescribere, nec potui hactenus absolvere."

36 *Ibid.,* p. 205: "ut breve aliquid typis edam, quo formam missandi depingam."

37 *Formula Missae et Communionis.*

38 W. A., 12, 214: "Sic de missa sentimus. In quibus omnibus cavendum, ne legem ex libertate faciamus, aut peccare cognamus eos, qui vel aliter fecerint, vel quae dam omiserint, modo benedictionis verba sinant interga et fide his agant."

absolutely the nature and meaning of the sacrament. This is not only opposed to all precedent, but is done in opposition to the word and example of Christ, so that even Christian liberty cannot excuse it, for it is the greatest damnable idolatry and blasphemy of God.[39]

(2) Liturgical liberty permits us to retain any part of the service or any liturgical observance which is not opposed to the Word. In this conception Luther differed fundamentally from the Reformed theologians, who desired to retain only that which was directly ordered by the Word. It is here that the life of the Lutheran liturgy manifests itself in many points which are regarded as adiaphora. We might refer to the wearing of clerical robes. Luther himself had laid aside his monkish robe in his home in 1523 while he still used it in the church service. On the ninth of October, 1524, he wore the monkish robe at the morning service, while in the afternoon he went into the pulpit wearing his academic robe, a custom which he retained after this time.

We shall pass by, he says, the question of vestments. But about these we hold the same as about other rites. We permit their use freely, just so that pomp and luxury be absent. For you are not more pleasing if you preach in vestments, nor are you less pleasing if you preach without vestments. For vestments certainly do not commend us to God.[40]

On Dec. 4, 1539, he wrote his well-known letter to Provost Bucholzer who was undecided what to do with regard to the request of the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg to retain cowl and surplice in processions on feast days and to walk about the church yard on Sundays and on Easter:

If your Lord, the Margrave and Elector, allows you to preach the gospel of Christ purely without man's additions, and permits the sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper according to Christ's appointment, then in God's name go round with them carrying a silver or gold cross, and a cowl or surplice of velvet, silk or linen. And if one of these be not enough, then put

39 *Ibid.*, p. 511.

40 "Vesta praeterivimus. Sed de his ut de aliis ritibus sentimus. Permittamus illis utere libere, modo pompa et luxus absit. Neque enim magis places, si in vestibus benedixeris. Nec minus places, si sine vestibus benedixeris. Neque enim vestes etiam nos deo commendant."

on three, as did Aaron, the High Priest, each one more beautiful than another, from which church vestments in the Papacy are named Ornata. And if your Lord, the Elector, be not satisfied with one procession, then go round seven times, as Joshua went round Jericho with the children of Israel, blowing trumpets. And if your lord has a desire, let him go in front, springing and dancing with harps, and cymbals, drums and bells, as did David when they brought the ark of the Lord up to Jerusalem. I have no objections to that. For such things, if not abused, neither add to nor take from the Gospel, but they must never be regarded as necessary.[41]

What a difference between the conception of Zwingli who as early as 1523 had declared that robes, crosses, etc., are not only neither good nor bad, but are absolutely bad, and the conception of Luther who was willing to retain all these things, as long as they did not interfere with the Word and the sacraments but helped in the worship of God in spirit and in truth!

(3) An overemphasis of these ideas would lead to disorder within the church, and therefore it became necessary to add the third principle: Liturgical liberty requires unity within the church for the sake of order. This unity of order, however, must not be based upon compulsion, but upon the free expression of the worship of the Christian congregation. Clearly the Apology upholds this principle in the statement: "We believe that the true unity of the church is not injured by dissimilar rites instituted by men. Although it is pleasing to us that, for the sake of unity and good order, universal rites be observed."[42] And again: "But we cheerfully maintain the old traditions made in the church for the sake of usefulness and tranquility .... and our enemies falsely accuse us of abolishing good ordinances and church discipline."[43]

The streams of life flowing from the liturgical principles of Christ and the early Christian church to, and through, the period of the Reformation, have poured their life-giving waters into the Lutheran church transplanted to a new continent, and again it becomes true that

41 Margaret A. Currie, *The Letters of Martin Luther*, pp. 378-9.
42 *Apology*, Chap. IV, 33.
43 *Apology*, Chap. VIII, Art. XV, 39.

THE LIFE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH OF AMERICA FINDS AN EXPRESSION IN ITS LITURGY

Firmly all the branches of the Lutheran church of America stand upon the declaration of the Augsburg Confession: "Unto the true unity of the church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites or ceremonies instituted by men should be alike everywhere."[44] The Courtland Liturgy brings out this idea precisely when it declares: "All Christians must be carefully taught at all times of the great difference there is between the ceremonies arranged by men for use in the church, and the Word of God, which alone saves, and the two sacraments; for these two, namely the Word of God and the two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are the sole necessary means for salvation which, without sin against the conscience, and without unavoidable offense against the Church of God, neither can nor may be perverted, changed, enlarged, or diminished by angels or men. Wherefore Paul says distinctly, Gal. I, 'If we, or an angel from heaven, preach unto you another gospel, let him be accursed. And in I Cor. XI, 'I have received of the Lord that which also I deliver unto you.' He also mentions the institution of the Supper. Then he speaks distinctly of ceremonies, saying, 'And the rest will I set in order when I come.' " A Lutheran service which does not have as its center the eternal Word of God is unthinkable. From the Invocation with its trinitarian formula, through the Introits taken largely from the Psalms, through the magnificent Gloria in excelsis, sung centuries ago on Bethlehem's fields, to the reading of the Gospel and Epistle lessons, continuing with the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and ending with the grand Amen after the solemn Aaronic benediction, the Lutheran liturgy enthrones the divine Word of God. Through its liturgy the Lutheran church of America takes its position unqualifiedly upon the Bible, and gives expression to its innermost life by singing the words of the battle-hymn of the Reformation.

44. *Augsburg Confession*, Art. VII.

While on this point there cannot be any difference of opinion on the part of all who claim the name of Lutheran, yet in the development of liturgical forms there has been the greatest variety, thus giving full expression to the principle of liturgical liberty. The Lutheran church of America has strictly observed the admonition of Luther in his German Mass:

> Before all things I kindly beseech, even for God's sake, all those who desire to see or to follow this our order in divine service, that they by no means make a necessary law out of it, nor entangle or bind anyone's conscience therewith; but that, in accordance with Christian liberty, they use their pleasure, as to how, where, and when and how long the circumstances suit or demand it. . . . . Yet I will not ask all those who have their good order of service, or who through God's grace can make a better one, to let it go and yield to us. For it is not my intention that all Germany should accept precisely our Wittenberg order.

A brief reference to the liturgical history of the former General Synod will illustrate this point. From its very inception the oldest general body of Lutherans in the United States, the General Synod, let it be known that it intended to cling to the liturgical observances of the past. As early as 1825 it appointed a committee "to prepare a Hymn-Book, Liturgy and a collection of Prayers in the English language for the use of our church."[45] Naturally this liturgy connected the life of the Lutheran church of America with the life of the mother church in Germany. This fact found expression in the instructions given the committee: to adhere in the preparation of the Hymn-Book and Liturgy "particularly to the New York Hymn-Book, and the German Liturgy of Pennsylvania as their guides."[46] The liturgy, as finally adopted, was to a large extent a translation of the liturgy of Pennsylvania, so that the statement could be made: "It is, in the strictest sense, the liturgy of the American Lutheran Church, since it originated in that part of the church which is the mother of us all and which even to-day is held in the highest reverence by the oldest congregations of our denomination."[47]

45 *Minutes of General Synod*, 1825, p. 9.
46 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
47 *Minutes*, 1841, p. 51.

It is to be regretted that the task of revising the liturgy, or of giving to the church a new liturgy, was undertaken at a time of doctrinal discussion within the General Synod. And yet what an interesting light upon the life of the General Synod during the middle of the past century the liturgical discussions of this period throw! While the committee on the liturgy reported at the meeting at York, Pa., in 1864, that the General Synod's liturgy should be the basis on which the new liturgy should be constructed, yet it was compelled to add: "Resolved, that on all subjects on which difference of doctrinal sentiment exists, Scripture language suited to either or both views is to be employed without comment."[48] The so-called Washington service, which was the outcome of the liturgical discussions of this time, shows plainly the result of the life of the General Synod of this time; for the committee informed the general body of the fact that it took the larger part of the new liturgy "from the former liturgy of the General Synod, the next largest portion from the Pennsylvania Synod's English Liturgy, others from the New York Liturgy, and a few from the forms of Dr. Seiss"[49]

Soon after this period, however, the life of the General Synod manifested itself through two tendencies: (1) the desire for a more definitely Lutheran liturgy; (2) the desire for unity in the Lutheran church. The movement for a Common Service, based upon "the common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century and, when there is not entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of greatest weight" gave expression to these tendencies. Not only did this service which was finally adopted in 1887, give a common liturgy to the United Synod in the South, the General Council and the General Synod, but it was at the same time the first step toward the final union of these three bodies into the United Lutheran Church in America.

It would be wrong to assume that the Common Service has in any way destroyed the principle of liturgical liberty as a part of the life of the Lutheran church of America. As early as 1831 the

48 *Minutes*, 1864, p. 26.
49 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

General Synod Constitution declared: "No General Synod can be allowed to possess, or arrogate unto itself the power of prescribing among us uniform ceremonies of religion for every part of the church."[50] Again, when the committee to prepare the Common Service met in 1884, it adopted the following guiding principles: (1) The result of the committee's labor must be referred to the bodies they represent. (2) No service dare be made binding on the congregation. (3) We are to provide the full Lutheran service with all its provisions for all who wish to use it, and leave the congregation free in the use of it. In 1885 another significant statement was added: "If at any time or place the use of the full service is not desired, it is in entire conformity with good Lutheran usage that a simpler service may be provided and used, in which only the principal parts of the service in their order are contained."

While thus the Lutheran Liturgy in the United States safeguards the principle of liberty, at the same time it gives expression to its conservative character by stressing just as emphatically the blessings of unity and uniformity, as long as they are expressions of worship in spirit and in truth. With the Apology our church declares: "We believe that the true unity of the church is not injured by dissimilar rites, instituted by men. *Although it is pleasing to us that, for the sake of unity and good order, universal rites be observed.* It is this principle of Lutheranism which makes it possible for our church to express its life through uniform liturgical observances not only in this country but also in the foreign field, yea which forms a bond of union of world-Lutheranism.

To these liturgical principles and practices which are the expression of the life of our Lutheran church, I solemnly pledge myself on the day of my installation. They shall guide me not only in my conception of liturgics but of the entire field of theology. As our church places the Word of God into the center of the liturgy, thus without reservation I subscribe, as the basis for all my teaching, to the statement of our constitution: "I receive and hold the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God, and as the only infallible rule and

50 *Apology,* Chap. IV, 33.

standard of faith and practice, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged." But, as on the basis of this living foundation, our church in the course of centuries has built up its liturgy and has ever conceded the right of subtracting from and adding to these forms, whenever the changing conditions and conceptions of the church have made a more perfect expression of the worship of God in spirit and in truth desirable and possible, thus I do not pledge myself either to a liturgy or to a theology which in all its details and expressions is a closed book, but to a living liturgy and a living theology which give expression to the ever growing life of the kingdom of God. As the church of the Reformation, while desiring uniformity in the worship of God, provided this uniformity flows forth from, and is an expression of, the life of the body of Christ, yet concedes the greatest liberty to its people and pastors in the use of the liturgy and has never made uniform customs the prerequisite of church unity, thus in all questions which relate to adiaphora and open questions, I shall ask for the application of the principle of Christian liberty for myself and my teaching, and shall grant this Christian liberty to my colleagues and to the students in the classroom. In all my work I shall be guided by the motto: *"In necessariis unitas; in dubiis libertas; in omnibus caritas." In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in all things charity.*

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGIONS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENTS[1]

Among the eleven "saviors" of mankind,[1] in addition to the personalities that are usually regarded as the founders of religions, the author includes Moses, Isaiah, Socrates and Paul. Jesus is of course included as the founder of a religion. But it is not this fact that entitles him or any of the others to a place in this Hall of Saviors, but the fact that he in common with the others radically modified his times by analyzing and interpreting correctly the peculiar needs of his contemporaries.

The work is not intended therefore as a contribution to the science of comparative religion. The author regards that science to be of dubious value, inasmuch as religions are not logically comparable. Religions are grounded in the social and historical material of the time and place where they originated and their true value cannot be estimated apart from the circumstances which gave them birth. For that reason great religious personalities should not be torn from their environment but studied against the social background of their times.

The Saviors of Mankind therefore is more than a collection of biographies and less than a study of comparative religion. It is an attempt to reconstruct the background which made these personalities possible and furnished them with their particular fields of labor. What is of permanent value in their work is their experience in dealing with certain manifestations and requirements of human nature. Situations change, but through all the changes which time brings with it there is a static element; and the study of how other ages dealt with this element enriches our heritage and should enable us to cope more adequately with the problems of our own day.

Apparently the author does not believe that we have as yet found the absolute religion. "One ought," he writes, "to secure from any correct appraisal of the age of each prophet materials for a new science and philosophy of religion. Such a result would give us new methods for combatting the degeneracy which overtakes all societies. The whole regenerative force of belief may be presented with greater certainty to achieve deeper and more general results. And a new era of spiritual discovery should replace the feeling that nothing further can now be added to revelation."

That attitude is very prevalent among a group of enthusiastic students

1 *The Saviors of Mankind.* By W. R. Van Buskirk. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 537 pages. $3.00.

of comparative religion and is responsible in no small measure for the uncertainty in many minds as to the claims of Christianity. Christianity does not claim that it alone possesses all truth. It acknowledges the validity of truth wherever found. But it does claim that it possesses the absolute truth with respect to God and man and man's relation to God in Jesus Christ, and that in the possession of this truth it has something unique and indispensable to offer the whole world. If it capitulates on this issue it loses the heart out of its missionary enterprise.

However, this attitude on the part of the author is his private affair and does not affect the intrinsic value of the book. As an introduction to a sympathetic study of comparative religion the book will be found exceedingly valuable. The author has gathered a vast amount of fresh material along historical and social lines which throws new light upon old subjects, and enables the student better to appreciate the purposes and methods of the world's outstanding religious personages.

E. E. Fischer

A NEW STUDY OF AMOS[1]

The Old Testament Prophets are coming into their own, and it is largely the work of our generation that has discovered them. Until about fifty years ago their writings were looked upon as the terrain or predictive texts. They themselves were little more than names, known by their citation in the New Testament. They were announcers, in advance of the facts, of Christian history. The reaction of negative criticism to this view was to banish prediction and reduce the prophets to the role of social and political reformers. That was the other extreme. Meanwhile a lot of good work was being done in the field of comparative religion and psychology. The discoveries from Babylonia and Egypt have shown that mantic phenomena were common in the Semitic world. The origins of eschatology have been recovered in a surprising way. The profound study of psychology has helped us to understand the prophetic consciousness.

All these elements have made a new study of Amos timely. Mr. Cripps shows that he was well qualified for the task. There is apparently nothing touching the prophet Amos which he has not mastered. He has the judicial temper which keeps him from hasty conclusions. E. g., while inclined to doubt the authenticity of Amos' oracle against Judah in its present form, he sees that Amos would be the last man to spare his own guilty people. Similarly he is not swept into argument with the hasty critical generalization that the prophets—and Amos in particular— condemned sacrifice as having no place in Israel's religion. Commenting on 4:4 he asks: "Is he not upbraid-

1 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos.* By Richard S. Cripps, M.A., B.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. xviii + 459 pages. $4.50.

ing his hearers for sacrificing at the sanctuaries *in such a manner* as to be displeasing to Jehovah?"

The Prophecy of Neferrohu and other Egyptian parallels have led some critics to find the origin of Hebrey prophecy in Egyptian oracles. There are striking similarities. Mr. Cripps observes that the moral note is so lacking that they cannot account for the message of an Amos.

As was to be expected in a present-day commentary on Amos, considerable space is given to Amos' visions. The visions make the prophet. "The visions of Amos are not purely contemplation—they are a means of his apprehending the truth." The author is not averse to finding the ecstatic element in them but the order would be, first, seeing the symbolical object, then falling into the vision state in which he was under the divine influence. The psychic vision provides the channel of revelation. The prophet is not left to think out his own message. He has a religious experience which gives him God's thought.

After a careful weighing of all the evidence, Mr. Cripps decides against the authenticity of the epilogue (9:8b-14), but he adds, "The addition was in general accordance with the divine mind. God's message to men of one period may be predominantly one of Repentance; to those of another ...., Hope. And the sentiment expressed in XXIX:11 must be eternally true: 'I know the thoughts I cherish towards you—thoughts of weal and not of woe—to bestow upon you a future and a hope.'"

H. C. Alleman

PAGAN REGENERATION[1]

Readers of this journal, desiring a more intimate acquaintance with the religious life of the Graeco-Roman world and, accordingly, a better appreciation of the immediate religious background of that great Empire into which Jesus came with his gospel and towards which the great Apostle to the Gentiles directed an earnest missionary zeal, will find in these pages a most readable account by a careful student of the sources. Dr. Willoughby, professor of New Testament literature in the University of Chicago, has given his own interpretation of the "mystery initiations" of these strange cults which have already been made familiar to us by such well-known studies as Cumont's *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* and Glover's *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire,* as well as by other studies.

We are introduced to the rites and philosophies of such mysteries as the Eleusinian, Dionysian, Mithra, as well as those of Orpheus, Magna Mater, Isis-Osiris, Hermes, and the mystical philosophy of Philo, the Jewish contemporary of Jesus and Paul. Out of this strange mixture and confusion,

1 *Pagan Regeneration.* By Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929. 307 pages; index. $3.00.

the author sees converging meanings: certain elemental human needs unsatisfied by current traditionalism, social, religious, philosophical, being met by recourse to supernaturalism and the occult. World-weariness was the temper of the times; there was hunger for vital interpretations of life with the assurance of salvation and a blessed future. It was a day of individualism in which religion to have any adequate appeal must stir the emotions, grip the imagination, and offer a definite consolation and hope. This end the rituals of oriental mysticism, esoteric practices, theophagies, incarnations and apotheoses, all of which brought divinity and humanity into intimate relationship, served to satisfy.

Wild as were some of these practices, and bitterly assailed by early Christian apologists and polemicists, they had tremendous social, religious and ethical value. In a common weariness and hunger both rich and poor, freeman and slave, were brought to a common level; life without vital religious meaning was found barren; moral aspirations seemed futile without supernatural sanctions. Into such a world the mysticism of Paul and the religion of Jesus interpreted as redemptive found surely the most fertile soil. In fact, it would be difficult to understand Paul's great program and perhaps his own psychology without a true picture of that environment. Many New Testament passages are thrown in a wholly new light.

It is made clear, by implication, how such rites as Christian baptism and the Christian Passover meal as well as such doctrines as the incarnation, preexistence, atonement, the indwelling of the Spirit, mystical experience, could easily be understood by the mind of that day. Just what the relationship is between these rites and doctrines of Christianity and those of the pagan cults is not discussed in the book (except by a suggestion which creeps into the Preface). The relationships, however, are so striking, as to suggest mutual influence. One can hardly escape the conviction that Paul's point of view was shaped materially by what he saw and heard. It was surely the mark of his genius, if so it be, that he found points of contact and (like John with his Logos philosophy) made the most of them.

Students of Pauline Christianity should not miss reading the account of this religious scene. One may himself single out certain evident contrasts and at the same time draw his own deductions as to the striking similarities.

VERGILIUS FERM

THE PRESENT CRISIS IN RELIGION[1]

This is a timely book. It is not blind to the critical period for religion through which we are passing. At the same time it bids us remember that there always has been a crisis in a living religion. The chief reason for the

1 By the Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D. New York: Harper Bros., 1929. 281 pages. $2.50.

present crisis is to be sought not in the attacks on religion but because the present state of religion is inadequate to the religious needs of humanity. The Evangelical Revival did indeed follow a similar period but the author points out that when Wesley began his work he still could appeal to the authority of the Bible among the people whom he addressed. Such appeal comes to the people of our day with little force. The neglect of worship among professed Christians too is regarded as responsible for the inadequacy of religion to meet present needs. Not only religion but morality as well is without an authoritative voice.

With this as a starting point the author discusses the prospects of recovery. Progress must bring man back to his need of religion. "We have only to carry a stage farther the trifling with destructive negations in thought to find ourselves facing absolute darkness; with destructive theories in social reform, to find ourselves facing chaos; and the nearer man comes to this, the more dramatically and quickly must he return to the only foundations of sanity: an eternal hope beyond this life and a spiritual anchorage beyond this world" (pp. 181, 182). This is followed by the reconsideration of Christianity, the keynote of which is that the complete Christian faith is alone adequate to human needs. In particular does the author stress the need of the fullest Christian faith concerning Christ, on which all else depends, and from which all else derives. In discussing the rehabilitation of the church and the revival of worship the author criticizes Protestantism and holds up for imitation Roman Catholic conceptions of church and worship. After the manner of not a few in the Church of England, he does not do justice to Protestantism at its best along both these lines. At the same time we may freely acknowledge that his insistence that the church and worship must be given their rightful place if Christianity is to meet the needs of the present crisis is fully justified. The book faces facts as they are, is positive in tone, and hopeful in outlook.

JOHN ABERLY

RESTATING THEOLOGY

If the need of a restatement of theology can be measured by the number of attempts to do so, then the need is indeed imperative. *The Christian God*[1] is another such attempt. Its peculiar purpose is to reconcile the idea of a god of revelation and redemption with the scientific principle of evolution. With details the book is not concerned: it deals with the great fundamental facts of our religion; and it is surprising to discover how easily the reconciliation can be effected, provided one is not too much of a literalist in his inter-

1 By Richard Roberts. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 154 pages. $1.50.

pretation of the Scriptures, nor too much of a dogmatist in his evaluation of science.

The opening chapter contains the key to the author's method. Religion in its widest sense is depicted as part of the great evolutionary process. Prayer, in the broad sense of desire to establish some kind of communication with a supersensible being, is the urge within man to complete his evolution in the realm of the spirit. It is the inescapable "thrust into the unknown-eternal." Revelation is the stimulus which is responsible for this urge. In other words, just as light was the stimulus, according to the evolutionary principle, which helped in the formation of the eye, so revelation constitutes the environment which evokes, then guides, man's spiritual aspirations for God. "Religion we may therefore describe as an activity in which there is a continuous and progressive mutual evocation of revelation and prayer."

The rest of the book deals more specifically with the Christian revelation of God in Christ,—with the historic Jesus, the incarnation, the Christian idea of God, sin and the atonement. There is an absence of the biological idiom, which is as pleasing as it is surprising in a book of this kind. The controversial attitude is entirely lacking. Only when the circumstances require it, does the idea of evolution enter in, and then always simply as a fact on the basis of which the author reconstructs a positive faith. As a matter of fact, the book has value even apart from its primary purpose. There is a freshness and suggestiveness about its presentation of familiar facts and circumstances which fascinates the reader.

In common with many writers of the present day the author refuses to use the language of the creeds in order to convey his thoughts. For example, Jesus has for him the absolute value of God, but he will not say that he is of one substance with the Father, simply because he does not know what the substance of the Father is. Jesus for the author is at once the full-grown man and the revelation of God. "On the one side, he is the product of the natural process, as we all are, its very crown and glory..... But we are also constrained to regard him (to use Whitehead's language) as the 'particular actual occasion' into which the unknown-eternal has in some unique way 'ingressed.' He is man towards God; he is God towards man. He is God in man and man in God. In him the perfect human aspiration meets the sufficient revelation of God. The Incarnate Word both came up from the ranks and came down from the throne." Thus Jesus is the fulfillment of the goal of human evolution in the realm of the spiritual. For such an emergence of the finished product before the process as a whole has been finished the evolutionary principle must make room. The author refuses to accept evolution as the only mode of the divine activity, and in this he finds even the natural world supports him.

Another reservation which he insists upon is that there is devolution as

well as evolution. He accepts the fact of a fall as true to life and authenticated by experience. The presence of sin in the world is the result of this fall. Its effect is "to hold up the traffic," that is, to frustrate man in his progress toward the goal. This effect can be overcome only as men learn to trust in the fatherly character of God and to show goodwill toward men.

It is in his conception of the atonement that the author departs most conspicuously from orthodoxy. He finds no place for a blood atonement in his theology. The idea of an atonement belongs to the home rather than to the law-courts. It is in the fatherly character of God that we must seek for the motive of forgiveness, and not in any thought of ransom. The influence of the cross is a moral one. Christ's victory there was a victory of faith—of an undiminished trust in God in spite of apparent defeat, and of an unchanging, forgiving love toward his fellowmen, in spite of their treatment of him. And this alone constitutes the victorious faith with which mankind can overcome the world. Only as we live by such a faith can we make progress toward the goal.

Whether or not this attitude toward the cross is necessitated by the author's general thesis that evolution and the Christian conception of God are not mutually exclusive is not made plain. We are inclined to believe that it is simply a part of his modernistic approach to the Scriptures rather than a logical necessity of his thesis. It indicates however how the effort to "restate" the doctrines of Christianity involves at the same time an electicism with respect to the material of revelation. Only by the elimination of certain facts can we alter the conclusions. As long as an effort is made to find a place for all the facts, orthodox convictions remain unimpeachable. The whole controversy therefore revolves about the attitude which shall be taken toward the Scriptures, and it is in that field that the decisive struggle will have to be waged.

E. E. Fischer

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY GOD?[1]

This is a unique and scholarly attempt to define just what characteristics and functions the being called God must possess in order to be integrated in the science, philosophy and religion of our modern world. The author does not look for his arguments to Scripture as revelation or to ecclesiastical tradition. Instead he delves into the study of human experience on its various levels of apprehension. Religion is to him essentially a mutual response between personality and reality. He writes: "God is not just another name for the universe; neither is he just a fantasy to satisfy human needs..... God must be as intimate, close and human as subjective imagery can fashion him, and yet he must be as remote, vast and incomprehensible as ultimate reality."

1 By Cyril H. Valentine, M.A., Ph.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 248 pages.

To accomplish this union of the two factors a bridge is needed. We cannot infer the existence of the object from the experience, since we need to test the validity of the experience by the nature of the object. What we need is a term that follows upon reason as reason follows upon perception. The term which Valentine finds most fitting is "responsive." Responsive is more than sense perception, and more than rationality; yet both are forms of response. Psychology recognizes and respects religion. But it questions the objective existence of the God of religious faith. On the other side stands only the universe of science. Neither of these postulates can satisfy the religious consciousness. Valentine writes: "If the idea of God can be accounted for as mere projection, and the doctrine of God explained as an example of rationalizing, then the God so discovered is a God made by man's own image, and such a God is not an object suitable to meet religious demands."

On the other hand philosophy pronounces that the element of objectivity which can be allowed to religious experience is very different in nature from what religion means by God.

The modern apologist may be able to show that the seeming antagonism between psychology and religion arises entirely owing to the failure of psychology to recognize its proper limits, and that within its limits psychology does not contradict but rather supports the validity of Christian experience.

The minimum essentials for the God of religion are two. As against psychology we must claim for God the nature of ultimate reality; as against philosophy we must claim for God the nature of responsiveness. Valentine then presents the various theories as to the origin of religious beliefs, from animism up to monotheism. The three classic arguments for a belief in God—the teleological, the cosmological and the ontological—find their place in this book but they do not furnish the heart of the thesis for the character of God. Religion is committed to the postulate that reality is responsive. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is and that he is the rewarder of all those who diligently seek him." A response to human need it must be, and, therefore, it must be qualified by human nature. "But the type of human nature which conditions this response is a developing manhood." The voice with which reality calls to the soul of man is a voice that speaks in diverse languages. Its voice is heard sometimes in the quietness of beauty, and sometimes in the trumpet call of moral obligation. It finds utterance also in the law and order of the natural world. "When religion is defined as response to reality, or more accurately as the response of the whole man to the claims of the whole reality, we are carried beyond the subjective side of experience and touch the objective side." It is essentially communion.

All knowledge is response, whether it be sensation, perception, behavior or science. The True, the Beautiful and the Good are the fundamental avenues of the mind, the soul, the will in their approach to reality. "In

different spheres of response, then, different attitudes in the subject are called for. In some instances intellect must dominate, and in others volition." Let me state in a sentence the central contention of Valentine in his own words: "The new postulate for the knowledge of reality must be, then, that reality as a whole is knowable by personality as a whole, or conversely that personality when completely integrated and fully developed is competent to know reality as a whole."

Faith of necessity plays a higher part in the adventure of religion than in art, in the sciences or morals. Faith is a key by which the nature of responsive reality is interpreted. It is not the function of faith to construct its object, but to construe. In the second part of the book Valentine treats of "The Responsive Subject of Christian Experience"—the developing, spiritual man. The four chapters are entitled, "The Nature of Religious Response"; "Response as Experienced in Communion"; "Response as an Index of Personality"; and "Response as the Basis and Authority of Morals." In the third part, the "Responsive Object of Christian Experience" covers the ground of "Christian Monotheism as the Centre of Response"; "The Divine Triunity as an Eternal Response"; "The Response of Divine Grace"; and "The Religion of Reality." None of this is easy reading but it is a book which richly repays study.

What shall we say of this book? In one sense its thesis of "response" is trite. In another sense its thesis is vital, vividly portrayed, and richly applied. Valentine does not pretend to present in a new dress, nor to base his theistic belief on any new arguments. He soars and circles around, and sometimes beyond, his central thought, but always to return to his main thesis. He grows too metaphysical towards the end, and in his attempt to include many of the theological postulates of dogmatics and ecclesiastical forms he rather weakens the force of his initial purpose, i. e. to furnish the scientist, philosopher and psychologist the minimum but essential content of the character of God and man's relation to him.

EDWIN HEYL DELK

SCIENCE AND THE UNSEEN WORLD[1]

Prof. Eddington's celebrated Swarthmore Lecture of 1929 contains the religious implications of his masterly book, *The Nature of the Physical World*. The author is Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge University, England.

Weyl in his great mathematical treatise, *Space, Time, and Matter,* says, "In our time there has been unloosed a cataclysm which has swept away space, time and matter, hitherto regarded as the firmest pillars of natural sciences,

1 By Arthur Stanley Eddington, F.R.S. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 91 pages.

but only to make place for a view of things of wider scope and entailing a deeper vision." Special points of interest in the new physics may be said to gather round Relativity and the Quantum Theory. The former deals with the structure of the world; the latter is concerned with the ultimate stuff of which the world is made. This is not the place to attempt an explanation of Einstein's work in Relativity which is the crown of the earlier work of the Michelson-Morley experiment and Minkowski's mathematical measurements.

In this lecture Eddington gives a sketch of inorganic and organic evolution. He has this to say of a naturalistic interpretation of creation: "I do not know whether this view is still held to any extent in scientific circles, but I think it may be said that it is entirely out of keeping with recent changes of thought as to the fundamental principles of physics. Its attractiveness belonged to a time when it was considered that the way to understand or explain a scientific phenomenon was to make a concrete mechanical model of it .... if today you ask a physicist what he finally made out the aether or the electron to be, the answer will not be a description in terms of billiard balls, or flywheels or anything concrete; he will point instead to a number of symbols and a set of mathematical equations which they satisfy."

Eddington takes the Kantian position: "In comparing the certainty of things spiritual and things temporal, let us not forget this—mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience." Our spiritual experiences are as real as bricks and atoms. We may the more boldly insist that there is another outlook than the scientific one, because in practice a more transcendent outlook is almost universally admitted. We do not ask whether philosophy can justify such an outlook on nature. Rather our system of philosophy is itself on trial; it must stand or fall according as it is broad enough to find room for this experience as an element of life. In speaking of "natural law" as determining everything, he says, "You can not apply such a scheme to the parts of our personality which are not measureable by symbols any more than you can extract the square root of a sonnet..... The essential difference, which we meet in entering the realm of spirit and mind, seems to hang round the word 'Ought.' In the physical world what a body does and what a body ought to do are equivalent; but we are well aware of another domain where they are anything but equivalent."

When we assert that God is real, we are not restricted to a comparison with the reality of atoms and electrons. If God is as real as the shadow of the Great War on Armistice Day, need we seek further reason for making a place for God in our thoughts and lives? Concerning the question of the personality of God he writes, "It is, I think, of the very essence of the unseen world that the conception of personality should dominate it. We have to build the spiritual world out of symbols taken from our personality, as we build the scientific world out of the symbols of the mathematician."

Those who can lay hands on the May 1929 number of the Expository Times will find a scholarly and illuminating article entitled, "The New Physics and Religious Thought." Relativity and the Quantum Theory are explained, and for religious thinkers. The section, "Some Reflections on Eddington's Book and the New Physics," will hearten us to face the revolution in physics and be assured of the abiding verities of religious experience.

EDWIN HEYL DELK

CHRISTIANITY AND THE MORALITY OF CAPITALISM[1]

Here is a bold and searching inquiry into the morality of our economic system, one that should provoke a wholesome self-introspection and lead to an honest self-criticism on the part of the business world. That there are troubled consciences with respect to this matter has been evident for some time. Vague misgivings and feeble protests have been uttered from time to time with respect to one or another tendency that is manifesting itself within the system. But it has remained for Prof. Ward to expose the working of the system in the clear light of day. With the expert knowledge of a trained economist and the zeal and fire of an Old Testament Prophet he lays bare its weaknesses and moral shortcomings and indicates in no uncertain way what he believes will be the ultimate outcome unless radical reforms are begun immediately. "The signs multiply," he writes, "that the times are ripe and rotten ripe for change." "There can be no question that the persistence of the morality of Capitalism means that the inevitable reaction will be the spread of the morality of communism." "When the day of awakening comes, it may find (the masses) capable of only unthinking fury." Perhaps these forecasts are too gloomy; nevertheless, one need not be a prophet to discern disturbing signs upon the horizon.

The factors in the system upon which the fire of criticism is concentrated are competition, profit-taking and property. The form in which competition is carried on in modern business has changed. In order to avoid the worst features of the system mergers have been effected and trade associations and co-operative selling agencies have been established. This has insured a measure of co-operation within certain organized groups. But "what has taken place is that co-operation for profits has at certain points taken the place of competition for profits." Instead of being carried on between individuals, competition is now carried on between organized groups. The struggle between competing grocers has given place to the struggle between chain stores. Wholesalers and manufacturers now compete when the latter sell direct. There is competition between industries to get as large a share as possible of

1 *Our Economic Morality.* By Harry F. Ward. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 329 pages. $2.50.

the nation's purchasing power, and groups of bankers compete for the investment markets.

Whatever benefits may have resulted from the elimination of competition within certain groups have therefore been offset by the transfer of the principle to the field of organized groups. It is there that the defects which inhere in the system as a system are now manifesting themselves. Mergers and mass-production have neither profited the workers, nor have they operated to lower prices, nor have they improved the product. Profits have been increased, but the workers on the whole have not shared in them. The cost of manufacture has been reduced but the saving has been eaten up by increased sales cost. In some instances the product may have been improved, but in general better financing has been made to take the place of better service. It is the financially strong that survive rather than the technically efficient. Thus the competitive system again stands indicted. It has run us into a blind alley from which there seems no way of escape.

In the matter of profit-taking the author likewise notes changes and adjustments made necessary by modern methods, but finds nothing in these changes to alleviate the situation. If anything, the evils in the profit motive have been multiplied. In its strict sense "profit is the net surplus of an enterprise at any given time after all costs are met or provided for." This simple rule has now been modified so as to enable it to cover other factors. The author quotes an economist who argues "that profits arise from two sources: technical efficiency and pecuniary strategy—the latter being the effective manipulation of the prices and values in which the business man deals." "It is in the field of financial manipulation that the business man now concentrates his energies in order to reap the largest profits."

The favorite method of manipulating finances so as to make a profit is by the issuance of stock which capitalizes "goodwill" or the possible or probable earning power of a corporation. In this way the capitalist manages "to live with his conscience." He contends that he deserves reward for risk-taking and his profit from watered stock is his reward. However, Prof. Ward maintains that it is not the capitalist that runs the risk but the people who entrust their savings to him. Should the venture prove unprofitable, it is the stockholders who are first to suffer and often they are the only ones. Theirs should therefore be the reward for risk-taking.

Then there is the claim of labor—"the hazard of life, limb and the working strength that lasts only for a time. In any rational society the risks of labor should be provided for first, for the interests of labor are prior to capital." Yet what is being done to safeguard labor in view of the risks which it is running? To what extent does it share in the huge profits of great mergers? "When the automobile market breaks, how much of the millions that have been made in motor stocks will be available to feed the unemployed

workers and their families? For that we have bread lines and soup kitchens, with their consequences in the deterioration of society. That risk the community carries and pays for dearly." Thus the profit-motive stands indicted.

Property is the third factor to be criticised. Property used to be defined as "the exclusive control by some person or persons of some person or thing." This definition no longer suffices. "Recent changes in the fact of property have shifted the basis of the discussion concerning its nature, it moral justification and its social validity."

For one thing, there has been a tremendous increase in the amount and kinds of what is called intangible property, in the shape of securities which capitalize not real property but so-called goodwill. The greatest increase in American wealth, the author maintains, has come from this source. In the second place, the control of this wealth, on account of its wide dissemination, has passed beyond the control of its owners and is lodged in the hands of a few, upon whose judgment and integrity the holders of securities must depend for the management of property. It follows from this that the function of property is changing. Property should be the expression of personality. As the result of labor it should minister to the development of personality. But at the present day it is rapidly becoming nothing more than a claim to income. And "the greater the extent to which property becomes merely a claim to income, the more grows the tendency of the owners to care for little but the spending of the income." Thus there is produced at one end of the ladder a class of idle rich and at the other a labor class who suffer by reason of the fact that there is withheld from them the rightful fruits of toil.

These are only a few of the facts which Prof. Ward marshalls to sustain his contention that our whole economic system is immoral and in desperate need of reform. Tinkering with it here and there will not suffice. The whole system needs to be recast in order to make it moral. One method of bringing this about is by revolution, and the reader is not allowed to forget that this is not only a possibility but a very threatening probability. The other is by a gradual transformation through the power and on the basis of the ethics of Jesus.

In order that this latter method may be effective two great requirements must be met. In the first place, we must change our "money philosophy," and be converted to the idea that a man's life does not consist in the abundance of the things which he possesses. And secondly, there must be a willingness on the part of the present investing class to yield power and prestige. Without self-renunciation there is no way out—save revolution and dispossession. That is the only alternative. But this can be avoided through a voluntary building up of some community of interest in which the motto will be "each for all and all for each."

The nature of these requirements makes it incumbent upon the church

to do what the author claims it has never had the courage to do—to face the issue of economic determinism squarely. Russia has faced this issue and settled it by making the machine its god and economics its religion. The better way is through a conversion to the ethics of Jesus, and this task the church should solemnly assume in these days of threatening catastrophe.

Prof. Ward thinks it is largely a matter of education. Conviction of sin and conversion, he holds, can be made a part of the educational process. This perhaps is the weakest element in a book that bristles with common sense and sound logic; for Jesus never expected that men would see the rationale of his way of life, save as they were brought under the transforming power of a life lived in communion with God. His ethics flow naturally and spontaneously out of his religion. But neither an enlightened self-interest, nor fear of ultimate consequences in the way of revolution or other evils will ever suffice to make men renounce wealth with its attendant power and prestige in order that they might live as brothers. For that religion alone will serve as a sufficient dynamic.

The author should not expect the church therefore to render a service which it has neither the power nor the authority nor the organization to render. The best that can be hoped for is that it will succeed in persuading its members so to act in their relation to others as to exemplify the principles of brotherhood. For the masses of men, those outside of the church, some other means of control must be found,—the state, for example, with its legislative and executive power. As a matter of fact, Prof. Ward's book should be read by every legislator in the land. When it comes to controlling economic policies in the interest of justice to the individual, the state is a far more effective agent than the church.

It is true, as Prof. Ward would no doubt contend, that it is futile to expect the kind of legislation which would usher in some kind of communistic life until people had been converted to the idea. We venture to submit that it is no part of the church's mission or function to convert people to any such idea. Sometimes the author seems to write as if his aim were nothing more than to usher in by peaceful means the economic system which Russia has established by force. If so, then he is wide of the mark when he makes his appeal to the church; for the church has nothing to do with the economic system under which men may choose to live. Self-interest, education and legislation are sufficient dynamics to "convert" men to this idea, if they want it. But this conception of conversion is far removed from the Christian conception of conversion—as far removed in fact as Russia is from the Kingdom of God.

This brings up the question as to what is Christianity's relation to economics. Prof. Ward pretends not to be able to understand Dean Inge when he says, "There are no economic principles in the gospels." We do not know

the passage from which the quotation is taken; but we can give an interpretation to the quotation which would enable us to agree with its author. Jesus did not set himself up as a judge or a divider of men in economic matters. It was a matter of indifference to him whether a man had much or little of this world's goods. What he was tremendously interested in was the effect of material possessions upon a man's relation to God. When he taught therefore that "a man's life does not consist in the abundance of the things that he possesses" he was not enunciating a principle in economics (Prof. Ward notwithstanding) but a great spiritual principle which should be applied by men under whatever economic system they happen to be living, whether capitalistic, socialistic or communistic. We agree that the great mass of men are not living according to this principle in capitalistic countries; but neither are they in communistic Russia. On the other hand, there is nothing in the capitalistic system as a system which would make it impossible for men to fulfill the divine requirement in this or in any other respect. In this sense it can be truly claimed that "there are no economic principles in the gospels"; and it is fortunate for obvious reasons that there are none. There are principles which aim at the control of man's relation to his fellowman, but they are religious principles and have as their end something entirely different from the communistic life whose chief good is found in an economic well-being.

Prof. Ward has thus fallen into the error of attempting an application of Jesus' ethics without giving due consideration to their religious background. Had he been content to criticise our economic system, as it deserves to be criticised, and made his appeal straighforwardly to the thoughtful business man apart from religious considerations; or had he made his appeal in a similarly straightforward way to the Christian business man and demanded of him that he put more religion into his manner of conducting business, his argument would have been more consistent. But by trying to make religious sanctions binding upon the consciences of men irrespective of religious loyalties, he has weakened his case, both for the man of the world and also for the Christian.

However, as an analysis of the trend in our economic life the book is exceedingly valuable. It should be read and pondered by the thoughtful leaders of the business world. Self-complacency can easily produce an attitude of mind which cries peace, peace, when there is no peace. If Prof. Ward's book succeeds in disturbing our self-complacency sufficiently to make us see things as they actually are, it will perform a useful service.

E. E. Fischer

AMERICAN IDEALISM[1]

Some of us must honestly, even though perhaps reluctantly, confess that in some significant respects our seminary training has been most inadequate. Of course, we are not supposed to learn everything concerning religion in a three-year theological course, but then there are some things we ought to know as we go out to minister to our own day and generation. It seems strange indeed that while so much was said in the seminary course about sixteenth and seventeenth century dogmatics in Lutheran Europe, so little relatively was said about the immediate background, rise and development of American Christianity and the great theologians and churchmen who have so significantly fashioned and are fashioning contemporary thought and practice in the religious life of America. We learned indeed about the strifes and struggles of European Lutheranism, Anglicanism, Romanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Puritanism, etc., but all too little about the continuation and contentions of these movements upon our own soil. More than once some of us have confessed to ourselves that we wished we knew more about the churches and the religious thought of our own country in order better to understand our own work and the mind of fellow Christians. It is a curious paradox that some of us have become better acquainted with remote days and situations than with our own contemporary time and place.

There are, of course, many good books to read to remedy this lack. To those whose experience has been similar to that described above I would recommend the present volume by Dean Weigle of the Yale Divinity School as a most fascinating introductory survey. It is "an outline" story of the development of American religious life from colonial days to the present, written in a style that will appeal to the whole family circle of readers. A good book, too, to put into the hands of the son or daughter. Every clergyman in America, especially, ought to feel at home with the material covered by this book.

The following are the chapter headings: Religion in American Life (a Foreword by Professor R. H. Gabriel, editor of the series); Spanish and French Missionaries; Pilgrims and Puritans; The Church of England in the Colonies; The Growth of Religious Freedom; The Churches and the Revolution; The Development of Free Churches; The Maturity of the Churches; Religion on the Frontier; Elementary and Secondary Schools; and, Colleges and Universities. Each chapter is introduced by a one page summary or outline. Then follow paragraph statements arranged topically of some of the most significant and representative events, men, and movements together with either a photograph, photostatic copy of some rare manuscript or out-of-print book, reproduced drawings or cartoon taken from the pages of some

1 By Luther A. Weigle. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928. 356 pages; index. $5.50. (Independence Edition; Vol. X in "The Pageant of America" series).

widely circulated American journal, illustrating the material of the text. There are over eight hundred illustrations making it a picture book as well as a book of story. America, it will be impressed upon the reader, is not to be understood as the land of misanthropic madness after Mammon, as may appear on the surface, but a haven and home of those who have held high the things of the Spirit and have built testimonials in manifold ways to the "unseen environment of mystery." Her history is intimately bound up in man's universal and perpetual desire to make adequate adjustments to the Infinite and the Ideal. The Yale University Press has put into circulation a publication beautifully constructed which deserves a reception commensurate with its investment.

VERGILIUS FERM

ECONOMICS AND RELIGIOUS REFORM[1]

A scholarly treatment of the economic causes that played a part in the severance of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England from the papal court in the time of Henry VIII has recently appeared.[1] Economic situations, or various factors of an economic or nationalistic complexion, are considered of major importance in the English separation from Rome and in the nationalization of the English church without the desertion of Catholic theology and worship. Efforts at religious reform are said to have played but little part. "The roots of the reformation reached deep down into the subsoil of money matters and of fundamental economic changes that were taking place. It is only in the added light that such facts furnish that the reformation in England may be clearly understood" (p. xxi).

Chapter I traces the development of the "Wealth of the English Clergy" and reaches the conclusion that by the sixteenth century they owned "about a third of the entire realm." (This striking statement, based on Mark 10:14, appears on page 3: "He (Christ) made the tenure of property a bar to discipleship.") Figures from the records of the period show the property holdings and income of the clergy. The conclusion reached is "that the church in England before the Protestant Revolt was possessed of an undue proportion of the national resources controlled by a small minority of the population. Papal provisions, absenteeism, pluralities, and appropriations of smaller livings by abbey and cathedral church tended to centralize this wealth more and more, making it a menace to the political power. This situation invited foreign interference, jeopardized national defense, and made trouble in the matter of taxation. The wealth of the clergy was inefficiently managed and put to abusive uses. Discontent over ecclesiastical abuses in the thirteenth century followed by a propaganda for disendowment in the

1 *Economic Causes of the Reformation in England.* By Oscar Albert Marti. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 254 pages. $2.50.

fourteenth were but steps that led to the utlimate attack on church property in the sixteenth century" (p. 25-6).

Chapter II considers the "Popular Protest and Revolt against the Papal Finance of the Thirteenth Century," caused by the imposition of papal exchequer and the economic abuses of the English clergy. A contributing cause is found in the clash between the papal vision of ecclesiastical imperialism and the incipient ideal of English nationality. Foreign interference came to be resented. Italian bankers, "evidently papal agents," French influence and papal provision for English benefices were considered a menace to England by the middle of the century. Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, led this protest and received strong support. "The result of the papal financial policy during this entire period .... was the breakdown of papal prestige. The constant demand for ever increasing sums of money coupled with extreme indifference to the spiritual welfare of the country caused many doubts as to the heavenly derived mission of the popes..... The Roman court appeared more and more as a worldly institution with imperialistic and purely temporal ambition. Papal envoys appeared in England to promote not religious edification but financial interests, so that resentment was awakened..... This attitude brought forth measures such as the Act of Mortmain, of Praemunire, of Provisors, and the final statutes that affected the ultimate break with Rome in the sixteenth century" (p. 77).

Chapter III deals with "Motives and Movements toward Disendowment of the English Clergy," which "took an organized and consciously directed form about the middle of the fourteenth century." Some precursors of disendowment receive consideration, but the chapter is devoted primarily to a full presentation of the theories and efforts of Wiclif on disendowment, and of their aftermath.

Chapter IV considers the "Revolt of the Reformation Parliament against Ecclesiastical Exactions in England, 1529-1536." The financial abuses on the eve of the Reformation are treated in four groups, (1) vacancies, involving "innumerable petty fees," (2) administering the sacraments, with a multiplication of reasons for fees, (3) the church courts, likewise oppressive by excessive fees and fines, and (4) papal taxation, which added to the already heavy burdens. There was a revival of discontent because of these conditions, led by humanists and churchmen—the latter, I think, though their efforts did not always succeed, injecting more religious causes into the movement than are recognized. The climax of unofficial protest against papal abuses was the "Petition of Beggars," about 1527. "For nearly half a century since the accession of Henry VII discontent and opposition had been given expression and had been gathering force until a rupture in the church was inevitable. It is only against this background .... that the attitude and action of the Reformation Parliament can be understood." Subserviency to

the Court "likely was responsible to a large degree both for the point of view and action of the Parliament." "But the point of interest is that this body passed a series of measures that tended to sever England from the papal jurisdiction and that the bulk of these measures had to do with financial and economic relation between the church and the people, particularly in the matter of monetary exactions. Such were the first and the second Petition of the Commons, the Act for the Annulling of the Annates, the Restraint of Appeals to Rome, the Act forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence, and .... the Act for the Dissolution of the Smaller Monasteries" (p. 151). "In all these acts .... the major grievance of the Commons was the financial and economic losses..... Economic reasons were a powerful factor in separating England from the papal jurisdiction" (p. 173).

Chapter V treats "Economic Factors Tending Toward the Final Secularization of Church Property in England, 1533-1539." "The forces that played a part in the sudden confiscation of ecclesiastical wealth in England (the suppression of the monasteries) after the break with the papacy in 1533 were at least four in number. There was (1) a fear of national disintegration; (2) the interest of the public weal and of the national defense; (3) the cupidity of the ruling classes; and (4) the passing of an old outworn economic order of things. Each of these factors as it reacted toward the secularization of church property has its basis in motives and conditions essentially economic. A rift in the state was threatened by an apparent defection of the clergy who were thought to be using their wealth to aid and comfort the enemies of the realm. Laymen coveted the wealth of the church as a means of strengthening the defenses of the kingdom and of mitigating the burden of taxation. The king, the nobles, and the new middle classes wanted the monastic lands to enrich themselves personally and to enhance their power politically. The economic organization rapidly developing, based on commerce and industry rather than agriculture, left little hope for the old feudal regime of the church to remain immune from attack."

"Whatever else may be said as to the motives back of precipitating the ecclesiastical revolution of 1533, it is quite evident that a desire for doctrinal reform played little part" (p. 175).

JOHN B. MOOSE

APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY AND CHURCH ORDER

The celebrated author of *Reality, The Four Gospels,* and other notable works, presents a fresh contribution to the history of Church Polity.[1] The seven chapters of the book were originally delivered at Harvard as the first series of lectures on the Hewett Foundation.

1 *The Primitive Church.* Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry. By Burnett Hillman Streeter, D.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. xiii + 323 pages.

These studies constitute a scholarly introduction to the literature of early Christianity. But that literature is surveyed chiefly from the point of view of the development of the organism of the Christian community. Canon Streeter takes issue at many points with Harnack and Lightfoot and maintains his reputation for brilliant reasoning and clear-cut presentation.

The author's purpose is a very practical one. For four centuries, he says, the theologians of "rival churches" have sought to vindicate apostolic authority for the type of church order to which they themselves were attached, whether Episcopalian, Presbyterian or Independent. His own thesis is that no one type of polity can be claimed as the only apostolic or primitive one, that in the New Testament itself there can be traced an evolution in church organization and that at the end of the first century there existed a wide variety of church government in the various provinces of the Roman Empire. Such primitive diversity in church institutions, which is the main contention of this volume, proves that among modern contenders everybody is right and nobody is wrong. Thus, it is hoped, one great obstacle to church union is removed.

The thesis concerning diversity of organization in the Primitive Church is well maintained. The author examines the trustworthiness of the documents concerning Christian origins, follows the Apostles in their work of organizing churches, and makes the rounds of the various sub-apostolic churches in the several parts of the Empire, Asia, Syria, Rome, Alexandria and the Patriarchates. Much new light is shed upon the documents, their origin and their interpretations, and the total picture is one of an ever-changing situation, more haphazard and at the same time more dynamic than students of the subject have hitherto imagined. The history of Church Order during the first century was the reaction of a living organism to changing environment. The original diversity was the response of the Gospel to urgent local needs. In a new age it was followed by standardization up to an efficient uniform model. "The history of Catholic Christianity during the first five centuries is the history of a progressive standardization of a diversity which had its origin in the Apostolic age."

The practical application to the present-day discussion of church union is that "ill-considered attempts at premature reunion may hinder rather than advance the cause..... In the Primitive Church no one system of Church Order prevailed. Everywhere there was readiness to experiment, and, where circumstances seemed to demand it, to change..... It may be that the line of advance for the Church today is not to imitate the forms, but to recapture the spirit, of the Primitive Church." It does not seem to occur to Canon Streeter that what he has really proved by all this scholarly and convincing argument is simply this: the Primitive Church made its greatest strides against surrounding paganism when Christianity expressed itself in a variety of organ-

ization and denomination, each part filled with vibrant and dynamic enthusiasm, and it only became impotent when and where external union brought about a stolid rigidity; therefore, the Modern Church will achieve its greatest dynamic not by any artificial union of external organization but by a vitalized unity of spirit and faith. And yet this would seem to be a natural inference from the Canon's own statement (p. 68): "The Christian Church of the present day is suffering, it may seem, from the inheritance of an organization unduly hardened..... In things spiritual, standardization is less profitable than in things material."

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY[1]

This volume is not intended to be a compendium, compressing all the facts and details possible into a brief scope. Its declared aim is "to help the beginner to a deeper appreciation of Christianity and to a better understanding of the Christianity of today by tracing out the path by which it has come." The style and the method of presentation should realize that aim. Part I sets forth the story of Church History, following the topics treated through to the present. Part II treats outstanding movements and developments and in like manner traces them to the present.

Part I gives "Christian History in Outline." It stresses the chronological sequence of events and seeks to give a perspective of history by treating significant individuals, events and movements. The aim is to create an interest that will lead to further and more intensive reading.

Part II treats "Christian Institutions and Christian Movements." It has chapters on organization, the papacy, monasticism, the spread of Christianity, the creeds, heresy, divisions and union, the influence of environment upon the church, and the influence of the church on environment.

A few illustrations will indicate viewpoints of the author with which all will not agree. He feels that the preacher may find "texts" in history "on the assumption that God's revelation did not stop with the year 100 A. D." (p. 19). In treating the relation of Christianity to Greek culture he says, "The attempts to square Christianity with the highest thought of the time resulted in the Hellenization of the Church" (p. 43). Of baptism and the Lord's Supper this is said: "The simple rite of baptism as an initiation into the church became a magical affair..... Its central significance, however, lay in the magical idea that the soul was regenerated by the water baptism. The eucharist was no longer a meal of thanksgiving in memory of the sufferings of the Lord but a sacrament in the stricter sense....." (p. 69). "What

1 By Arthur Wilford Nagler. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929. 568 pages. $3.00.

had at first been a simple rite (the eucharist) had become, partly through pagan influence, a sacrament efficacious in itself. . . . ." (p. 271).

In the Chapter XIV, on "Christianity in America," only a passing acknowledgment is made of the Scandinavian and German elements that entered, and of their contribution. In Chapter XV, on "Developments in American Christianity," they receive no notice. Certainly these groups deserve more than passing consideration in the life and development of American Christianity.

The author speaks as follows of the Luther's doctrine of justification: "Justification means forgiveness. It does not mean that God declares a man to be righteous. . . . ." This does not clearly state Luther's position. In Luther's theology justification appears as an act of God by which, for Christ's sake, he forgives men all their sins and counts them righteous, a forensic act, imputing the righteousness of Christ to the believer (p. 149). Of Wesley he says: "He differed not at all with the teaching of his church and never felt that he was offering anything new" (p. 191). This is an unwarranted assumption that the Established church had accepted Arminian teaching in the place of its Calvinism.

In the main the author's presentation is objective. However, subjective notes appear. Of the period following the Schmalkald War we read: "Numerous doctrinal controversies, too insignificant to mention, rocked the Lutheran church. . . . . The artificial solution in the Formula of Concord (1580), a theological treaty of peace which was supposed to contain the essence of truth on all disputed points, led to Protestant Scholasticism. As in its mediaeval prototype, dogma became supreme, the Bible an arsenal from which to draw proof texts, and Christianity a religion of adherence to orthodoxy. Practical and ethical considerations, so prominent in the teaching of Jesus, were supplanted by abstruse, finely spun theological distinctions. The life of the spirit shrank in this atmosphere of legalistic, arid doctrinalism" (p. 147). Again, "Prolonged strife over petty questions of doctrine thrust out matters of far greater religious import. . . . . Peace was purchased at a terrific price. All theological truth . . . . was held to be embodied in perfected and final form (Formula of Concord) from which no divergence even as to phraseology was to be permitted. Protestant Scholasticism threatened to extinguish the life spark of religion in its insistence upon the primacy of dogma, upon the external standards established once for all by the learned theologians. As in mediaevalism, so in seventeenth-century Lutheranism the externals—the framework, the forms and symbols—usurped the commanding authority rightfully held by the soul in its experience of contact with the Eternal" (p. 175). Again, "The doctrinal basis of Lutheranism is found in the Augsburg Confession of 1530. . . . . on the whole, the Platform of Protestantism over against Catholicism is well stated, especially the

differentiation between salvation by faith and salvation by works. What might be called an expansion of this standard confession is known as the Formula of Concord, ... Even in its shorter form, the Epitome, it contains very profuse explanation in scholastic terminology of disputed points in theology, closing with a lengthy refutation of the heresies of the Anabaptists, the Schwenkfeldians, the New Arians, and the Anti-trinitarians. The Augsburg Confession vibrates with life, but here we begin to enter the valley of doctrinal dry bones. The Confession is still a standard in practically all Lutheran churches, the Formula of Concord has sunk into deserved oblivion" (p. 350-1).

Calling the problems treated in the Formula of Concord "doctrinal controversies, too insignificant to mention," and "petty questions of doctrine," does not make them such. There is also evident confusion of the results of the Formula of Concord with the work of the dogmaticians in the next century. Nor does this "Protestant Scholasticism" among the Lutherans account for a similar development among the Calvinists. And though the Formula of Concord "has sunk into deserved oblivion" the problems it treated have their antitheses at the present day.

JOHN B. MOOSE

A GENTILE'S SURVEY OF ZIONISM[1]

The subtitle is a misnomer. In stead of being "a Gentile's survey of Zionism" the book is the special pleading of a Zionistic Jewish mind. For "he is not (alone) a Jew who is one outwardly." Dr. Holmes was sent to Palestine last winter by Mr. Nathan Straus to report what Mr. Straus had good reason to believe Dr. Holmes would find. Dr. Holmes, in the premises, is a Zionist advocate. He writes eloquently of what he saw, but his testimony is strongly colored by his sympathies. "Scratch Palestine," he says, "and you will find Israel." He is moved by the Hebrew shrines, and the ancient prophets stand out clear before his eyes, but he makes but one scant reference to the prophet of Nazareth (except to discount the Christian tradition). With such eyes one would see Zionism as fulfilling the Messianic hopes of Israel—and severely castigate, as he does, the British government for failing to propagate it.

Political Zionism is an anachronism, as Dr. Leon Wolf, one of the ablest Jews of his day, said years ago. The orthodox Jews who adhere to it confound the Messianic mission of their people with nationalism. That chimera perished with the Jewish monarchy. "The chief difficulty with Zionism," says Dr. Wolf, "is the religious question. The proposed state would have to be orthodox or secular. If it were orthodox it would have to revive the

1 *Palestine. A Gentile's Survey of Zionism.* By John Haynes Holmes. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. xviii + 271 pages. $2.50.

whole Levitical polity, and in these times it would either pass away through internal chaos or it would so offend the modern political spirit that it would soon extinguish itself from the outside. If it were secular it would not be a Jewish state. The great bulk of supporters would refuse to live in it, and it would ultimately be abandoned to Hebrew Christians and Christian Millenarians..... The whole movement is based on erroneous premises. It is based on the idea that antisemitism is unconquerable, and thus it is artificial..... With the passing of antisemitism Jewish nationalism will disappear. If the Jewish people disappear with it, it will be only because either their religious mission in the world has been accomplished or they have proved themselves unworthy of it."

H. C. Alleman

LUTHER AND CATHOLICITY

The collection of writings by scholars, both Roman and Evangelical, who are masters in their own fields of research, under the editorship of Alfred v. Martin, the erudite editor of the now defunct "Una Sancta" church journal, is a distinct contribution to the Reformation literature of this year.[1] A thorough reading will do much to fix Lutheran conceptions on the matter of church unity, not only with regard to the movement on foot for union among all Protestants, but also with regard to the deeper unity of the church of Christ.

The various contributors give the impression of knowing whereof they speak. And well they should, for we find here such names as: S. Merkle, C. Dryssen, A. V. Mueller, N. Soederblom, J. Albani, J. W. E. Sommer, H. Hansen, O. Piper, H. Ehrenberg, G. A. Glinz, F. Heiler, A. Fischer, A. Hettling, N. Hackl, E. Sinz, R. H. Wallau, A. Bigelmair, H. H. Ehrler and W. Leonard. The evaluation which these scholars give of Luther, though both Romanists and Evangelicals are well represented, is free from extremes. Luther is neither canonized as a saint, nor condemned as a devil. His shortcomings are recognized, but also his virtues, as a valiant prophet of God, striving to correct errors, and to implant truth. Through the progress from article to article, it seems as though the Lutheran church were robbed of the great Reformer, as a sectarian possession, in order that he might be given to the whole church of Christ and to the world.

Some of the fields in which these writers see the ecumenicity of Luther showing itself in a prominent way may be mentioned. A great part of his theological thought is seen to find its source, or rather a source, in Augustine and the Augustinian tradition, that is, in the old Catholic church, in contradistinc-

1 *Luther in oekumenischer Sicht.* A Compendium by Roman and Evangelical Writers, edited by Alfred V. Martin. Stuttgart: Fr. Frommanns Verlag (H. Kurtz), 1929. 266 pages.

tion to that of the Renaissance, whose chief teacher, if not saint, was Aristotle. Luther's protest was thus in many respects against a modernistic trend that had made itself felt in the church during the three hundred years preceding the Reformation. His doctrine is thus found to be ecumenical not only because it was apostolic, but also because it was the accepted doctrine of the old church.

Again the fact is noted that the great Reformer never sought a break with the living church, that that break came from Rome in the first instance, that Luther's conception of the church, as exemplified in Article VIII of the Augsburg Confession, the Schmalkald Articles, the Catechisms, and numerous sermons, is that of the ecumenical creeds, emphasizing the existence of "one holy, catholic and apostolic church." The symbolic utterances of Luther are seen to be so framed as to do no violence on the Evangelical side to the dogma of the church as laid down shortly after the promulgation of the Nicene Creed.

Luther's position with regard to the Carlstadt enthusiasts, and enthusiasm in general, is examined; also his subjectivism. Luther's thought concerning the whole church and his meaning to that church is constantly brought out. In the prayer-life of this man is seen a wonderful consciousness of the communion of saints. In the outline of the Small Catechism for morning and evening devotion is found perhaps one of the simplest and yet most striking testimonials to Luther's ecumenical conceptions. So also the Schmalkald Articles, despite their polemic tone, carry witness to the ecumenical heart of Luther's thinking, in defining neither the sola verba nor the sola fides as the doctrine of a standing or a falling church, but the doctrine of salvation through Christ alone.

Luther's greatest work is described as the preserving of the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ to the church. His one-sided emphasis of this doctrine, to the exclusion of others, his building of a whole system of theology about it as a kernel, is termed a heresy, but is described as one of those heresies which must always exist in the church, if it is to remain alive and bear a faithful witness.

The book as a whole presents no co-ordinated plan for healing the breach in Christendom between Roman and Protestant. But it suggests many ways in which the time of such a healing may be brought nearer. It is pointed out that a way to harmonious fellowship in Christ among all Christians may be found not in covering up differences that are manifest, not in emphasizing and magnifying the differences that do exist, but in acknowledging differences, and testifying to them, that they may together find solution in the truth; and by emphasizing the great store that both the Roman and the Protestant have in common.

The body of Christ, his Church, which despite fine doctrinal evasions remains nevertheless divided because of the Roman-Protestant schism, can-

not be healed until Protestants acknowledge faults as well as virtues in the Reformers, and seek virtues as well as faults in the Roman church; and until the Romanists acknowledge the debt which not only the whole church, but also their wing of the church, owes to the Reformers, and to Luther in particular, and are willing to receive and claim him as a true son of the church.

WILFRIED TAPPERT

CAN THE AFRICAN MEASURE UP?

Not only an interesting biography but also a study in race relationships that has most valuable lessons for our time is to be found in the story of Dr. J. E. K. Aggrey.[1] He was a native of Africa, the son of a chief on the Gold Coast. He was educated in America and served as a professor in Livingstone College in North Carolina. When the Phelps-Stokes Foundation, assisted by mission boards in Britain and America and by governments in Africa, planned a survey of educational work in Africa for their guidance in shaping educational policies, Dr. Aggrey was chosen as one of the members of the commission.

In spite of a strong color prejudice which he had to face almost everywhere, he by his tact and ability became one of the most influential members of that commission. When mission councils tried to fit the recommendations of the commission's report to their mission work, he then took a prominent place as a trusty adviser and counsellor in their educational programs. South Africa saw his worth and wanted him for its established institutions. But he accepted a call to the new institution launched on the Gold Coast at Achimota. For the starting of this institution he labored in association with Principal Fraser and others. Prejudices had to be overcome—confidences had to be won. There was not wanting an agitation that the kind of practical education that was to be given was only another white man's scheme to keep the colored man from raising himself. Dr. Aggrey was a follower of Armstrong and Booker Washington, who believed that such a practical education was the only one that would enable Africans to rise and take their rightful place among the races of mankind. After most strenuous work that he did in the starting of the Prince of Wales College at Achimota, he returned to America to finish his work for his Doctor's degree at Columbia. While in New York he came to what seems to us an untimely end—just when, it would seem, he was most needed.

Dr. Aggrey was a real Christian. This is the most striking fact brought out by this biography. He was also a scholar. He proved, it would seem, that in sheer intellectual ability the African can measure up to the best the European can produce. "He was one of the most Christlike men I have

1 *Aggrey of Africa.* By E. W. Smith. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 292 pages.

known and he was perhaps the greatest interpreter of men to one another that I have ever met," writes Mr. J. H. Oldham, who has had extraordinary contacts with men of all races. Dr. Aggrey's biography has a message for the churches if not for the nations. His illustration of the white and black keys of the piano which are both needed for full harmony in music, typical of the place that white and black races must fill in that social order that alone can make for a harmonious world, is likely to leave a permanent impression. Though Dr. Aggrey was a missionary directly for but a very short time, we regard this as one of the most informing and helpful missionary biographies that has yet been produced. It ought to be read by everyone who wants to understand the work and problem of missions in their larger tasks in Africa and in the world.

JOHN ABERLY

YOUTH AND ITS PROBLEMS

In the *Intimate Problems of Youth,*[1] Dr. Rudisill goes right to the heart of those physical, mental, moral, social and religious problems that at once challenge and baffle youth. A good theoretical background and a large practical experience as instructor, pastor and parent enables him to deal with the most difficult situations in a practical and convincing manner.

Dr. Rudisill looks upon life through sympathetic eyes. In spite of their failures and disappointments he sees youth of today finer and better than it has been at any time in history. Introspection may bring the adolescent to conscious inferiority or even to the verge of pessimism. But with wholesome environment, a real chance, and the proper incentive he will grow into wholesome, conscious superiority. For him the world will offer hope, promise and achievement.

The process of growing up is a constant series of problems, many of which are jealously guarded and studiously hidden from unsympathetic eyes. Among them is the great, mysterious urge of sex. What does it mean? Must it be thought of as low and forbidden, or should it be regarded as an avenue to the highest fulfilment of human relationship? Surely the day of prudish sentimentalism is past. At any rate Dr. Rudisill plainly discusses the real meaning of sex—its uses and abuses. Youth needs that sympathetic understanding that will enable it to make the proper adjustments to the opposite sex, and in harmonious, clean-minded companionship work toward the fully rounded life.

To be sure there will be discipline, both from without and within. Youth has glorious dreams that will cause many a heartache and disappointment. The glow of the immature enthusiasm must pass through many a sobering,

1 By Earl S. Rudisill, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929. 217 pages $2.00.

tempering experience before youth rises above the handicaps of partial knowledge and inexperience. But he will rise. A choice of lifework must be made. He must learn the use of leisure, the danger of idleness, he must also develop through recreation and those disciplines that mean culture. It is a matter of growth, slow and tedious, but nevertheless constant and sure of attainment.

Moral and religious attitudes complete the life. Each stage of development will lift the youth to places of broader outlook and riper conviction. With the establishment of worthy ideals he is able to reach out into a properly balanced life. Knowledge is important. Faith goes beyond knowledge into the unknown but possible world of discovery, science and life. The greater our scientific advance the more our wonder at it all. And each onward step enables us to fit more perfectly into the creative plans that prepared the world for man and called it good.

The whole treatise is modern, sympathetic and helpful. Parents, pastors and youth itself will be rewarded by a careful study of this intimate approach to the problems that loom so large in the path of the unfolding life.

M. Hadwin Fischer

RECENT ESCHATOLOGICAL THEORIES[1]

Eschatology has been receiving more than ordinary attention in recent times. This is due not merely to the vogue started by Schweitzer's attempt to make it the chief thing in the Gospel; it is also due to a revived interest in the subject because of the World War. This brochure would therefore seem to be particularly timely. The literature is first given. Then the problem is stated. This is followed by a discussion of the way the various theologians, and the schools of theology, have tried to solve it—Schleiermacher, the critical-speculative school represented by Troeltsch and Ritschl; the mediating school represented by Nitsch, Martensen, Gerlach and Dorner; the Erlangen school represented by Frank and Luthardt; the modern-positive school represented by Kaftan, Seeberg and Heim; the Pietistic school of Würtemberg represented by Blumhardt; the Biblicist school represented by Cremer and Kahler, Schlatter and others, and now the Dialectical school represented by Barth and Brunner. A diagram showing the representatives of these schools and their relations closes the book. This brings together recent eschatological theories in a clear and helpful way. It is a convenient handbook for those who desire to know recent views on this subject.

John Aberly

1 *Die Entwicklung der Echatologie von Schleiermacher bis zur Gegenwart* von Lic. Willi Olsner. Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. 116 pages. 3.80 and 5 M.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Behold the Man. By Friedrich Rittlemeyer. Translated from the German by Erich Hofacker and George Hatfield. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 167 pages. $1.75.

Dr. Rittlemeyer is one of the foremost religious leaders in Central Europe. He is known for his critical studies of Nietzsche, for his work as editor of religious journals and for the excellency of his preaching when a minister in Nuremberg and Berlin. The book is a historical and psychographic study of the "Life," the "Personality," the "Message of Jesus." The last lecture is entitled, "The Significance of Jesus for Our Times."

It is the result of twenty years of study of Jesus in order that the "total picture" of the personality of Jesus and its reaction upon the author's mind may bring to others something of the satisfaction and joy which communion with such a life engenders. On the whole it is written from a conservative point of view. As an expression of a deeply religious soul, it is full of beauty and faith in the unique character and work of Christ. There is little of apologetic, but much of enthusiasm. The older interpretative categories as touching Jesus' person are surrendered for the modern ethical interpretation of Christ's personality. But the divine incarnation and redemptive work of Jesus give substance and power to the Life of Lives.

EDWIN HEYL DELK

The Albigensian Heresy, Vol. II. *Its Suppression by Crusade and Inquisition.* By the Rev. H. J. Warner, B.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1928. 224 pages.

This splendid piece of work is a companion to and completion of a study of the Albigensian heresy begun in Volume I. The first volume traced the sources of the Albigensian heresy and described its tenets and system. In this volume is given the account of the efforts to overcome this heresy through preaching as a result of the work begun by Dominic, and this failing, its suppression by Crusade and Inquisition. It is clearly shown that the Crusade was an adaptation of military measures originally taken against enemies outside the church, as in the Crusades to the Holy Land, while the Inquisition was a development of legal measures against enemies within the state. The part played by political jealousy and expediency on the part of representatives of both state and church is clearly brought out in the changing fortunes of the Albigensians. The Crusade having failed either to win or to crush the Albigensians, the Inquisition was resorted to and by all the nefarious methods known to inquisitors succeeded in crushing the long present heresy, although voices were raised against both methods. The author made full use of original sources and this enhances the value of the work. The two volumes present, in brief scope, a useful study of the Albigensian heresy and its suppression.

JOHN B. MOOSE

In Search of God. By John Walker Powell. New York: Macmillan Co., 1929. 160 pages. $1.50.

The title of the book indicates the author's method of approach. What he has attempted is to tell the story of man's search for God as revealed in the books of the

Old Testament, and the progressive reward of this search in the growing appreciation of the ethical character of God.

From a literary point of view the work is exceedingly well done. The high spots in Israel's history and in the prophetic and poetic literature of the Old Testament are strung together in the form of a fascinating narrative. As in Lewis Browne's *Stranger Than Fiction*, there is evident a desire to bring the history of Israel within the bounds of the plausibly historical. The supernatural element in its narrower sense is minimized, and natural reasons are found for many events and circumstances which the original writers attributed to a direct divine interference. The book differs from Browne's work however in its reverent tone and its deeper appreciation of spiritual values.

For those who belong to the old school of devout readers of the Bible as God's revelation, books like these will appear to be utterly destructive; and so they are of a certain attitude toward the Scriptures. They can be justified only on the supposition that for large groups the old attitude has become an impossible one and needs to be displaced, if the Bible is not to be discarded entirely. The book is recommended therefore as profitable reading for those who may be facing this dilemma.

E. E. Fischer

The United States and the World Court. By Philip C. Jessup. Foreword by Elihu Root. World Peace Foundation Pamphlets. Boston, 1929. 159 pages. $2.00.

The issue of this work is both timely and important, and, coming from such an influential body on so great a theme, will doubtless have great weight in guiding and forming opinion in the effort to have our own nation join this finest attempt ever made for world-wide peace. It presents the sincere effort of the world's greatest statesmen and diplomats, not to confer on how to wage war successfully, but how to usher in an era of peace, based on confidence and faith in human leadership. The concluding paragraph of Mr. Root sets forth the present status of the relation of our own country to this great question of world-wide interest:

"Nothing remains but the question whether in the practical working arrangements proposed for giving effect to the Senate resolutions there is anything that so imperils the interests of the United States as to prevent the execution of a major policy of the United States. To the study of that question this history should be a valuable contribution."

Albert Bell

The Glory of Going On. By R. Moffat Gautrey. New York: The Abbingdon Press, 1929. 154 pages. $1.00.

We have before us a volume of twelve good sermons; splendid we might call them, according to form and contents. For the benefit of the readers we give the subjects: 1) The Glory of Going On; 2) A Call to Advance; 3) A Call for Courage; 4) The Prophetic Office; 5) The Motherhood of God; 6) Citizens of Eternity; 7) The Magnetism of the Cross; 8) The Wounded Christ; 9) The Pierced Hands; 10) The Great Conundrum; 11) The Riddle of the Ages; 12) Pioneers of Progress. Numbers 1 and 7 are based on New Testament texts; all the others are taken from the Old Testament. But after a short orientation concerning the original setting of these texts, the author reveals the fulfilment in the light of the New Testament. The application, in every case, is to present day conditions, upon which wonderful light is shed from the texts. These sermons were preached from Methodist pulpits on different occasions. The reader will notice from the start that they were carefully prepared; that a Christian personality stands behind them, whose passion it is to awaken souls and to win sinners for Christ.

There is no reason why these sermons could not have been preached from Lutheran pulpits. We take exception, however, to the wording of sermon-subject number 5, though we agree with the thoughts expressed and developed. We thank the author for having made these sermons accessible to a larger circle.

PHILIP J. HOH

Voices of the Age. (Prophets of the New Day). Edited by J. Presley Pound. New York: Harper Bros., 1929. 222 pages. $2.50.

Leading ministers, professors and students voted the men represented by sermons in this volume, the prophets of our modern day. The "prophets" named are: Revs. Hough, Gordon, Fosdick, Dean Inge, Bishops McConnell, Tittle, Brent, Prin. Jacks, Profs. Niebuhr, Coffin, Davis, Rufus Jones, C. Morrison and Sherwood Eddy. Each of these has contributed a message characteristic of his best work. These messages have to do with personal religion, the church, and its social task. They are choice sermons.

H. D. HOOVER

Rightly Dividing the Word. By J. Newton Davies. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929. 299 pages. $2.00.

Prof. Davies makes a plea for a more extended use of the expository sermon, and by his exposition of selected New Testament passages shows the possibilities of this method of preaching. In reading the book one feels like the two disciples on the road to Emmaus when Jesus "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." The author brings forth such an array of facts new and old from his treasure chest of truth that one is reluctant to leave until he has read the very last page. His paraphrasing at the beginning of a number of his chapters is unusually helpful. To the man in the pulpit such a book is invaluable. We need the expository sermon today. Prof. Davies' work is an inspiration to preaching " in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

GEO. B. ELY

Lutherisches Missionsjahrbuch für das Jahr 1930. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Missionskonferenz in Sachsen durch W. Gerber. Leipzig: Verlag H. G. Wallmann. 160 pages. 2.50 Marks.

This is the forty-third number of this valuable year book. The foreword is from the pen of Bishop Ihmels. This is followed by valuable articles on mission work in India, Africa, and among Moslems. More general articles treat of such subjects as Paul the missionary and confessions as related to mission work. Valuable as these are, the student of missions will find the *Rundschau* of missions, first in a brief chronicle of leading occurrences during the year 1928-29, followed by statistical tables of all German missions and of all non-German Lutheran missions of other lands even more valuable. This is followed by a bibliography of mission books and pamphlets published during the year and a directory of mission societies. No student of missions can afford to be without the information with which this yearbook is packed.

JOHN ABERLY